The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LIX NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 7, 1929 NUMBER 766

Contents

The Week

Editorials

Gastonia and the Honor of the South 299
A Test for Mr. Hoover 300
Two Prison Mutinies 302
Lady Chatterley's Defender 303

General Articles

Two Decades of Negro Life....Robert W. Bagnall 304
The X Plan in the Clothing Trade.....Thomas W. Holland 306
The Battle of Hollywood.....Somerset Logan 308
Rudy Vallée.....Martha Gellhorn 310
Washington Notes.....T. R. B. 311
From a Country Notebook.....Lewis Mumford 313
Bricks without Straw (verse).....C. C. Wilson 314

Correspondence 314

Reviews of Books

A Haitian Speaks for Haiti..Raymond Leslie Buell 318
The Wave.....Robert Morss Lovett 319
The Knights of Labor.....Paul H. Douglas 320
Peace on Earth.....John Hayward 321
Chicago.....Janet A. Fairbank 321
Ardors of an Archeologist.....Lyman Bryson 322
Weeds over Bronze.....Horace Gregory 322

The Week

PRESIDENT HOOVER and Premier MacDonald, in announcing the cessation of construction work on new cruisers, are taking a momentous step which the whole world recognizes as a pledge of good faith in the effort to reach an agreement on naval reduction. They are acting on exactly the same principle which The New Republic favored when it opposed the fifteen-cruiser program in the first place. It was argued then, by sincere reductionists, that it was necessary for the United States to show its will to build up to Great Britain before the British Admiralty would be ready to admit the principle of parity, which they believed essential for agreement. Whatever necessity to build may have existed at the time has disappeared since the MacDonald government acceded to power. Parity is an elusive conception at best, and what our naval authorities believe is parity may be thought superiority by the British authorities. The way to stop naval competition is to stop building, and the way to stop building is to stop building. Though only a first step, the action of the two chief executives signalizes a dramatic change of direction. We hope they will follow it with equal courage and largeness of spirit. There may be doubt whether Mr. Hoover acted within his strict legal authority, but, if he did not, we can only say that irresistible pressure should be put upon Congress to give him the authority required.

MR. HOOVER also made a brave gesture when he published the figures showing that our military expenditures are now larger than those of any other great nation, and announced his intention to economize on the army as well as on the navy. He is the first chief executive to point out the obvious truth—which others of less prominence have so frequently demonstrated—that the chief hope of further tax reduction lies in reducing expenditures for war purposes, which take up the lion's share of the budget. We have been fond of lecturing Europe for spending so much on military establishments, but we have failed to remove the beam in our own eye. Whatever reason there may be for a large United States navy, we certainly have less excuse for a costly army than any other great nation. Our land frontiers are not menaced by powerful or hostile neighbors, and our sea coasts are protected by thousands of miles of ocean against serious invasion. But Mr. Hoover will have to do more than ask the advice of the military experts and the General Staff if he wants to cut our army costs materially. He will have to adopt a real policy of "cutting until it hurts."

DR. R. L. BUELL, Research Director for the Foreign Policy Association, is the author of an interesting suggestion in regard to a possible way to attain a rough approximation of parity between Great Britain and the United States without forcing either country to maintain cruisers of a number, size and armament which it does not want. Recalling the French proposal that cruiser and destroyer tonnage might be considered to some degree interchangeable, Dr. Buell examines the present situation of the two powers if cruisers and destroyers should be added together. At Geneva the United States proposed a total for the two classes, combined, of 450,000 to 550,000 tons. At present, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States has 617,000 tons and Great Britain 635,000. The United States could reduce its tonnage to 550,000 by scrapping fifty-seven destroyers; and since only 106 of its 262 vessels of this class are now in commission, not even the Navy should weep very hard at such a prospect. The British could come down to 550,000 tons by scrapping seventeen of its old cruisers, part of the thirty which will become obsolete in 1940. Under this plan, the United States would go on building twenty-three large eight-inch gun cruisers and ten six-inch gun cruisers. The British Empire would continue to build its present program of eighteen large eight-inch gun cruisers and thirty-two six-inch gun cruisers.

THIS proposal is, of course, put forward in a pragmatic spirit. Dr. Buell would doubtless concede that there is no such thing as actual parity, and that if there were, his plan would not attain it. Presumably he would also agree that neither Great Britain nor the United States has any real need of 550,000 tons of cruisers and destroyers, no matter in what proportions, if the two fleets are not to be used against each other. If nothing better can be done, this suggestion offers the possibility of a *modus vivendi* which would be preferable to complete failure, but we sincerely hope that Hoover and MacDonald will be able to follow up their good beginning by genuine reduction of active naval forces.

IT IS DIFFICULT to know how much change in French policy is foreshadowed by Briand's succession to the premiership from which Poincaré has retired. Poincaré is traditionally the irreconcilable nationalist, while Briand has on numerous occasions opposed him in the role of an apostle of reconciliation and accommodation. When Poincaré last assumed office his majority could be assured only by a coalition which Briand entered as foreign minister. Both have acted together in recent important issues, notably the debt settlement with the United States, while Briand has reappointed the Poincaré cabinet. Briand is clearly the better man to deal on sympathetic terms with MacDonald in England just as Herriot, the Premier during MacDonald's former incumbency, was just the person to agree with him at Locarno. Briand may be expected to move toward his expressed ideal of an economically united Europe, which may in some degree offset the wealth and economic power of the United States. The road even toward a European customs union is long and arduous, and would be impossible to traverse without British consent. We shall undoubtedly see interesting developments in this quarter.

DESPITE continuing reports of armed conflict along the Manchurian-Siberian border, the belief is growing that the dispute between Russia and China over the Chinese Eastern Railway will be settled amicably. China has announced that she will use peaceful means, and if Russia refuses to arbitrate, will refer her case to the League of Nations. Moscow has already intimated that she is willing to negotiate, provided China will hand back the railway. Persistent reports come from Berlin that the two powers are about to begin discussions in that city, either directly or through German mediation. China has one good reason for wanting to settle the dispute without the intervention of the Great Powers: she does not wish a formal declaration by several governments that she must return the railroad to Russia, which would be a bad precedent in her campaign for the abolition of all sorts of special privileges. Russia also has a reason for wishing to settle the dispute directly: it would be a serious blow to her prestige both at home and among her radical friends throughout the world if, because of her insistence on the sanctity of private property as exemplified in the C. E. R., a group of conservative and capitalistic nations were to pull her chestnuts out of the fire for her. Both the disputants have now reached a place where they are looking for a chance to climb down without loss of dignity. Under the circumstances, while the danger of war has not been wholly averted, it is less than it was ten days ago.

IN GREAT BRITAIN national attention is centered upon the troubles of the cotton textile industry because a half million workers have refused to reënter the Lancashire mills and accept an enforced cut of 12½ percent in their already inadequate wages. All authorities are agreed that cutting wages will not permanently help the industry, that it needs something much more fundamental. A commission of inquiry was promised by the government even before the strike. It will have to consider the overcapitalization of the mills as a result of the war boom, the undercutting of Britain's foreign markets by growing textile industries in India, China and Japan, the world-wide over-equipment of the industry, the slackness of managerial method and of technical improvements. Among the suggested remedies are reorganization of capital structures, consolidations, introduction of mass-production methods and other improvements, restriction of output. All this sounds very familiar to those conversant with the troubles of the cotton industry in this country. But there is one essential difference. In England, because the workers are 100 percent organized and able to offer resistance, the issue receives the concerted attention of the nation. In the United States, because the mill employees are largely unorganized, the employers can resort to the dangerous and ineffective remedy of wage cuts as often as they will. They have done so frequently of recent years, and neither the government nor any other authority has regarded the situation as being worth the slightest concern.

THE BATON-ROUGE CONFERENCE of the American Institute of Coöperation has apparently given a boost to the prevailing idea that farmers'

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coöperatives are essentially business institutions to be run on large scale business methods, and that they can be organized from the top down by ballyhoo and high-pressure salesmanship. The formation of a grandiose National Chamber of Agricultural Coöperatives looks in this direction, as do the speeches of Secretary of Agriculture Hyde and others. Yet the history of coöperation proves, if it proves anything, that great aggregations engaged in marketing the whole of single crops are very unstable, unless they rest on well-knit, local coöperative units. The farmers regard them, not as institutions of which they are a real part and to which they owe loyalty through thick and thin, but as distant business organizations which are worth while only so long as they offer immediate advantage. Successful coöperation requires coöperative habits, it requires the improvement of quality and the standardization of output; in other words, it requires methods which the farmers can learn only by long experience in the self-reliance of intelligent groups.

DAMN it as you will, there is no denying that the complex set of phenomena known as the machine age has a glorious way of rising to the occasion in an emergency. The President of the United States wrote a letter not long ago. A waiting aeroplane caught it up and tore with it to Atlantic City, New Jersey. There it was rewritten on a giant Underwood typewriter, in letters six inches high on stationery fifteen by nine feet. From Atlantic City it was rushed to Boston, in a nine-foot mailing tube, strapped to the side of a Roosevelt biplane. Blushing at the triviality of our ten-point Caslon type, but conscious of our duty, we do our part in giving the message to the world. The letter:

> My dear Mr. Culver:
>
> I cordially share your view that an outstanding opportunity for public service awaits the Realtors in the field of stimulation of home ownership, which is so vitally related to the health, happiness and civic pride of our people.
>
> Yours faithfully,
> (signed) HERBERT HOOVER.

Gastonia and the Honor of the South

THIRTEEN men and three women are on trial in North Carolina for the murder of one man. The state does not contend that any one of these sixteen committed this murder; it only contends that they "incited" the state of mind in a larger group which made it possible. Some of the defendants in this case are textile workers; some are union organizers. Part of them, at least, are Communists, and like nearly all Communists, are agnostics or atheists. For all four of these reasons, the defendants are highly unpopular in the community where the murder took place—Gastonia—and throughout the state. How bitter is the feeling against them, is told in a statement by former Judge Frank Carter of Asheville, one of the leading attorneys of the state. Said Judge Carter:

> My original impression that they [the defendants] were, first, the victims of a brutal tyranny rarely witnessed in the South, and that they are now dangerously menaced with still greater injustice under the forms of law, has ripened into firm conviction.
>
> I see in this case a ruthless purpose, amazingly supported, to smother heresy, religious, industrial and political, in its own blood, which savors more of the fifteenth than of the twentieth century. While it is insisted that the controversy be held within the narrow confines of legal technicality, I see underlying the issue of blood-guilt a fundamental challenge of human liberty, of equality of right as between the man who labors and that other man who makes commerce of his labor.

Judge Carter is of course not alone in holding this view. The International Defense Committee has for its slogan, "Save the victims of the Gastonia Frame-up." The International Workers' Relief of Germany has protested by cable, in the name of 600,000 workers, "against the industrial and police terrorism and class injustice exercised against the textile workers." From many quarters has come the inquiry: Is this to be another Sacco-Vanzetti case?

Great indignation has been aroused in the South by this criticism. Southern newspaper editors insist that the strikers will be tried, not for Communism, atheism or activity in the textile strike, but for murder. "Outsiders," these editors say, in effect, "have no right to assume that justice will not be done in this case. They can trust the South to treat these defendants fairly." And by a curious twist of logic they go on to say that if injustice should be done, the clamor of the "outsiders" will be responsible. According to this argument, liberals and radicals were responsible for the death of Sacco and Vanzetti; by their agitation they aroused the emotions of Massachusetts people until fair dealing was no longer possible. It is even stated baldly that the agitation throughout the country was responsible for the tragic outcome of the Frank case in Atlanta. If the South had been let alone, the South would have vindicated this confidence.

There is no doubt that the view expressed is a sincere one, and that it is widely held. In its favor, as a practical policy, moreover, is the undoubted fact that the anarchists in the Sacco-Vanzetti case, and perhaps some Communists in the present one, are less concerned with rescuing the victims than with making the trial an occasion for propaganda on behalf of their cause. They consider that they are engaged in a war, and if a few martyrs will aid their side, they feel toward the loss of life or the suffering somewhat as a General does who orders soldiers to go forward knowing that part of them will never

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

return. This point is, however, extraneous to the main one, which is: shall the defendants have a fair trial? The Southerners who demand hands off assume that justice is a local issue. It is not; those who administer it should be prepared to meet the challenge as to their fitness, and the character of their acts, from whatever quarter it comes. To argue that injustice is permissible because doubt is expressed in advance that justice will be done is a monstrous perversion.

There is ample justification for the world-wide interest in the Gastonia situation in the recent history of the relations between organized society in the South and the textile workers. The Southerners who insist we should assume that justice will be done overlook the fact that repeatedly, in recent weeks, justice has been trampled under foot. Not only in North Carolina but in other states, the testimony of impartial witnesses is that the machinery of government has worked hand in glove with the mill owners and the leaders of industry in general to break the morale of the strikers, end the strikes and prevent the creation of unions. Civil liberties have been denied. State troops have been loaned to the mill owners, and paid by them, to fight the strikers. All this is because the feeling is widespread in the South that the continuance of the present prosperity is dependent upon keeping labor down. Under these circumstances, the South cannot say that it comes into court with clean hands. Despite the fine statement of the presiding judge on the first day of the Gastonia trial, there is grave question whether the defendants can get a fair trial, in the true meaning of the phrase, in Gaston county, even with a jury from another part of the state. It is a question whether they can get a fair trial in any other county in North Carolina, or indeed, even if the trial could be removed to some other nearby Southern state.

Gastonia now has the opportunity which faced Governor Fuller and President Lowell in the Sacco-Vanzetti case, and which they so tragically missed. Just treatment of those victims would have been the best possible answer to the charges of the radicals that they were not being punished as murderers but persecuted as enemies of capitalistic society. Just treatment of the Gastonia defendants would be an answer to the communist charge of a frame-up. But the South cannot expect the public opinion of America to close its eyes and ears and await the outcome with unconcern. If there should be a miscarriage of justice, it might be too late to rectify the error, as was the case in Massachusetts. The South is not a collection of neurotic children who must be permitted to play out their game in solitude and seclusion. It is not only the honor of the South which is at stake, as the Southerners are so morbidly conscious, but the honor of America. Public opinion, therefore, has the right and the duty to know what is going on, and to do what it can to see that nothing happens which future generations will regret.

A Test for Mr. Hoover

IN HIS SPEECH accepting the Republican nomination for the Presidency, Herbert Hoover said, "An adequate tariff is the foundation of farm relief." The trouble which he has earned as a result of endorsing that fallacy is rapidly being written into the records of history. But Mr. Hoover has never been ardent about protection; we may perhaps believe that he endorsed it as a fancied campaign necessity, and we may still hope that he will do his best to get out of the bad bargain. Another passage in the same speech, however, deals with a proposed measure to which he has been much more thoroughly committed, and one which, in the normal course of events, he would be expected to push through his first regular session of Congress. It is the improvement of waterways to lower transportation costs, and especially the construction of the deep waterway from the Great Lakes to the sea via the St. Lawrence. Concerning this Mr. Hoover said, with conviction, "There is no more vital method of farm relief." It will therefore be an unpleasant necessity for him to confront the scholarly and, it seems to us, conclusive report by Harold G. Moulton and others of the staff of the Institute of Economics in Washington, which demonstrates that the St. Lawrence waterway would scarcely provide any farm relief, that it would not fulfill in other respects the hopes of its supporters, and that the project is thoroughly uneconomic. Will Mr. Hoover ignore this report? Will he be able to controvert it? Or will he be wise enough to admit his mistake and concede that, of the three strings of his farm-relief bow, two at least have failed him?

There is no good reason why anyone should not have been attracted to the St. Lawrence waterway plan, lacking such an exhaustive and impartial report as that which has just appeared. It is a gigantic engineering project of the sort which appeals strongly to the modern American mind. There is romance about the proposal to convert Chicago, Duluth, Cleveland and the rest into deep-sea ports, at whose docks would lie freighters from the far corners of the four seas. And, as Mr. Moulton's book, "The St. Lawrence Navigation and Power Project," points out, numerous worthy interests have been attracted by the claims that it would relieve congested traffic on the railways, that it would reduce transportation costs both of the freight carried over it and of that carried on competitive routes. But now that more of the sordid facts are obtainable, the romance of these promises in great part disappears.

The distance by the new waterway from the Lake ports would be longer than by the present water and rail routes to the Pacific, to South America, to the West Indies, to our own Atlantic Coast, to Mediterranean ports, in fact to all except the northern European ports, and to these the saving would be only about 300 miles. The proposed minimum depth of channel, on which the present estimates

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are based—twenty-seven feet—would not permit the passage of modern ocean liners but only of tramps and other vessels including but 5 percent of the tonnage of the passenger-cargo ships now carrying our foreign trade and but 38 percent of the cargo ship tonnage. Lake boats could not navigate the oceans, and a compromise type of vessel is not feasible. If the channel were, at great expense, deepened to permit the more efficient liners to use it (the larger liners are rapidly driving the tramps and smaller boats out of ocean traffic) the chances are much against liner service being established. The practical navigation season on this route for ocean vessels would hardly be more than six months and a half, on account of the ice, and shipping companies could neither find work elsewhere for these costly ships during the winter, nor afford to lay them up when ice-bound. Furthermore, the reduction in speed necessary to go through the fifty-three miles of locks and canals, and the sixty-seven miles of restricted channels, would so cut down the earnings of such boats that they would hardly be used. Even smaller liners which could traverse the twenty-seven foot channel would scarcely do so under these conditions.

Omitting further consideration of a deep channel, the study goes on to show that the estimate of cost by the Joint Board of Engineers for the twenty-seven foot depth is much too low. It omits interest on the capital during the period of construction. It does not consider the cost of harbor improvements and port development in the Great Lakes necessary to handle the anticipated traffic. These would be large and expensive. Adding a modest 20 percent to cover other unexpected expenses—since experience shows that waterway projects invariably cost far more than the original estimates—the report arrives at a total capital outlay, by the people of the United States and Canada, of $712,000,000 for the navigation improvements. This assumes that the power projects would carry one-half the expense of the works necessary for both navigation and power, and includes the cost of the Welland Canal, already being built by Canada. It is to be compared with an estimate of about $250,000,000 by the engineers.

For this expensive waterway, the possible traffic would not be enormous, as is shown by a careful analysis. This analysis, which assumes that the project would not be completed for ten years (rather slow farm relief, by the way), makes the liberal allowance of a 50 percent growth in the available tonnage during that period. It assumes that railway rates would not be lowered to meet the competition of the water carriers, and it includes all the traffic at present moving on the route. This maximum estimate of traffic is 10,500,000 tons, of which Canada would roughly contribute half, and of which about 60 percent would be grain. A serious shipping problem is indicated by the fact that the inbound traffic would be less than one-third of the outbound, and in the case of Europe, less than one-ninth. Where are the return cargoes, so important in paying shipping costs? There is little chance, therefore, for liner service to develop.

But perhaps the thing is worth while just to help move the grain and thus to relieve the farmer. Mr. Edwin G. Nourse contributes an interesting chapter on this point. Most packing-house products require special refrigerator equipment which would have to be provided on the railways in any event during the closed season in navigation, and would thus be used the year round in preference to incurring the risks and delay of water traffic in the hot months. Corn is not exported in considerable quantities. Dairy products are not likely to compete seriously for foreign trade. Perhaps 75 percent of the rye exports during the open season would use the route, as well as some of the barley. Wheat, however, would furnish the principal hope of traffic. But the wheat territory tributary to the Great Lakes is declining as an export surplus area. The eastern part of the region is now a deficit territory. The hard spring wheat of the Northwest states is mostly milled for domestic demand. The Southwest crop now moves, and would continue to move, principally through the Gulf ports. A considerable volume of the grain exported from the Lake region would be taken by Atlantic ports at rates which defy competition, because of the desirability of wheat as a deadweight cargo for the liners which sail from these ports. Much of the Canadian wheat would use the new Hudson Bay route, which is much shorter, during the open season. Furthermore, it is advantageous to hold a large share of the grain until after the peak of the harvest, for better prices, and this means holding it at Lake ports until after navigation has closed. For the limited amount of grain thus available for the new waterway, the reduction in rates would be only four cents a bushel, instead of eight cents, as the promoters of the waterway have claimed. Even this reduction would not accrue entirely to the benefit of the farmer.

As a measure for relief of railway congestion the waterway is not needed now as when first proposed, since the railways have, and are likely to have for a long time to come, adequate facilities. Indeed, it would not be open to navigation during much of the peak traffic. If additional facilities were needed, however, Mr. Moulton demonstrates that for the same price we could build three double-track freight railways from Chicago to, say, Boston, whose theoretical maximum tonnage capacity would be ten times that of the waterway. The cost of the railways would, moreover, include the cars and locomotives, while that of the waterway does not include the ships.

The report is not so bearish on the waterpower aspect of the project as on the navigation aspect. It does make a difference to water-power, however, if we assume the navigation project is to be abandoned. In that case, the works necessary for hydro-electric purposes would have to be carried entirely by the sale of power, since none of the cost could

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be apportioned to navigation. This would so raise the price of the electricity that, after adding in the expense of transmission, it could not be sold in competition with current produced by modern steam methods in a region so distant as that of New York City. Markets would have to be developed nearer the source, and these do not at present exist in sufficient quantity.

In conclusion, the study shows that the annual expense of the navigation project to the people of the United States and Canada, which is not covered by tolls and freight charges, would amount to not less than $3.50 a ton for such tonnage as would use the route. This would be equivalent to eleven cents a bushel on wheat and rye—the principal items of traffic. In order to effect a reduction of about four cents a bushel in freight rates (which the American farmers would not be able to collect in full) we should therefore have to pay out about eleven cents a bushel. Hardly a paying proposition!

If this study cannot be upset by an equally careful and disinterested one, Mr. Hoover will have to make a difficult decision. He may feel that his commitments and his reputation as an economist require sticking to his guns. His natural combativeness may induce him to try to see it through. But we believe that his reputation would gain more in the long run by an admission that he has been wrong. For the true sign of the scientific spirit is not so much to be always right as to be willing to learn even unpleasant truths from conscientious analysis of the facts.

Two Prison Mutinies

WITHIN seven days New York State has seen two insurrections among prison inmates. Although they must have known that their effort was practically hopeless in advance, thirteen hundred men at Dannemora and seventeen hundred at Auburn mutinied and engaged in a desperate struggle. Three convicts were killed at Dannemora and two at Auburn, and in the latter place, eleven others and four guards were wounded, one of the latter perhaps fatally. If you think of a prison as a place where bad men are made over into good citizens, these incidents mean a tragic failure. The worse among the prisoners have clearly been subjected to no improvement, and the better have evidently been degraded. The important question to be answered is: Why and how?

Criminologists today are divided broadly into two groups. One of these emphasizes the influence of heredity and environment on the criminal and regards him primarily as a sick soul which must be brought back to health. The other school holds the conservative view which has come down to us through the ages: the criminal is assumed to be morally responsible, and must be punished until he has suffered a moral reformation. The harsher the punishment, the likelier it is, under this theory, that he will be reformed. Those who hold the first view do not as a rule advocate the abolition of prisons; they merely argue that the question of moral responsibility is one which is involved in a whole tangle of other facts, and therefore ought to be a matter for special judgment in each individual case—as was pointed out by the late Dr. Pearce Bailey in The New Republic some years ago.

It is the second view which, on the whole, prevails in New York state and in many other states at the present time. The Baumes laws have greatly increased the penalties for certain crimes, and for repetitions of crimes. Thus a burglar who carries a deadly weapon is automatically punished much more severely, a fourth offender gets a mandatory life sentence, and so on. While a majority of enlightened criminologists denounce these laws, and the philosophy which lies behind them, their influence is growing and New York's example is being copied by other states.

The Baumes laws have a close connection with the outbreaks at Dannemora and at Auburn. Since the term of the average criminal is longer than it was, he is also likely to be in a more uncompromising mood. A life-term prisoner, or one who is in for thirty or forty years, feels that he has little to gain from being good. He may even feel as some of these convicts evidently did feel, that a dash for liberty with the chances a hundred to one against him and a strong risk of being killed, is better than rusting in his cell.

This is not, of course, the whole explanation. It is well known that these institutions, and others in New York as well as throughout the country, have been greatly overcrowded in recent years. This is partly because prison-building has not kept up with the growth of the population and partly because, with more numerous and longer sentences, existing facilities are increasingly inadequate. Auburn, the oldest prison in New York state was built to hold a little more than twelve hundred men; today it contains seventeen hundred. The excess population of Dannemora is in the same proportion. Even without this overcrowding, conditions in both these ancient and archaic prisons would be bad enough. George W. Alger, after making an official investigation, described Auburn as "atrocious," and little has been done to ameliorate the evils he found. Another investigator said of this prison, "the cell block is a huge mass of stone, perforated with little cells, damp and without plumbing or ventilation, in which the prisoners live, to use a phrase of Stevenson's, 'like weevils in a biscuit.'" New York is treating its prisoners as savages; it is not surprising that they sometimes behave as such.

Those who support the "frightfulness" policy will of course argue that such conditions as these are quite all right: the worse the life inside the prison, the more a potential criminal will hesitate before doing something which will put him there. They will add, as Senator Baumes has already done, that the outbreaks at Dannemora and Auburn simply show that desperate men need rigid control. But

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such an argument, we submit, ignores the most important fact of human nature. If 3,000 men mutiny today who did not do so last month or last year, their action cannot be laid simply to the depravity of their nature. These two outbreaks and the other similar incidents of recent months are a symptom that something is seriously wrong, and evidently getting worse, not with the convicts but with the system of punishment and the conditions under which that system is carried out. The State of New York has no more important task today than to find out what it is and how to correct it. We are glad to report that Governor Roosevelt is already moving vigorously in that direction.

Lady Chatterley's Defender

ORTHODOX opinion has pretty well agreed that D. H. Lawrence's latest novel, "Lady Chatterley's Lover," is an out-and-out piece of obscene pornography. One reverend gentleman has even written to The New Republic to protest against our publishing a review of such a book. We feel, however, that the book was well worth reviewing, and that the review of it which Mr. Edmund Wilson wrote was a just one.

Our opinion that "Lady Chatterley's Lover" is an important and serious piece of work has lately been considerably strengthened by reading the author's introduction ("My Skirmish with Jolly Roger"; New York: Random House) which he has written for a popular-priced edition of the book to be published in France. As the title of Mr. Lawrence's introduction indicates, he is concerned in it primarily with exposing the literary pirates who have been stealing his book, and with a denunciation of them (under the present American copyright laws, there is nothing he can do but denounce them). But incidentally he defends the book itself against its many critics, and explains why he regards this novel "as an honest, healthy book, necessary for us today." Whether or not "Lady Chatterley's Lover" is all that its author claims for it, we feel most decidedly that his intentions, as he has stated them, are both honest and respectable. Whether or not the book itself is to be regarded as a failure (a bad novel, a pornographic novel) must remain for some time an open question. The whole vexed problem of art and morals has perhaps never been put up more uncomfortably plainly to a squeamish world. A reader who was unfamiliar with Lawrence's work, and who read "Lady Chatterley's Lover" quite unsuspectingly, might conceivably be inflamed, or shocked, or angered, or disgusted, or horrified; after reading Lawrence's own introduction, however, we do not see how any open-minded person could conscientiously allow himself to indulge in any of these emotions.

We should like to reprint Lawrence's remarks entire, but must content ourselves with quoting what seem to be the most relevant:

> . . . This is the real point of this book. I want men and women to be able to think sex, fully, completely, honestly and cleanly. Even if we can't act sexually to our complete satisfaction, let us at least think sexually, complete and clear. All this talk about young girls and virginity, like a blank white sheet on which nothing is written, is pure nonsense. A young girl and a young boy is a tormented tangle, a seething confusion of sexual feelings and sexual thoughts which only the years will disentangle. Years of honest thoughts of sex, and years of struggling action in sex will bring us at last where we want to get, to our real and accomplished chastity, our completeness, when our sexual act and our sexual thought are in harmony, and the one does not interfere with the other.

Lawrence's position on the sexual muddle has always been, to give him his due, perfectly clear—and no whit different, really, from the position which most intelligent modern people have agreed to regard as the sanest and most wholesome one. Many people who would agree absolutely with Lawrence in a theoretical discussion of sex, however, feel that he has gone too far in "Lady Chatterley's Lover." And on the other hand, according to Lawrence, the very "advanced" young people, who "take sex like a cocktail," despise such a book. "It is much too simple and ordinary for them. The naughty words they care nothing about, and the attitude to love they find old-fashioned. . . The book, they say, shows the mentality of a boy of fourteen."

Anyone who has followed Lawrence's work knows that he is a serious artist—in his own way, a moralist. Whether we like his art or approve of his moral doctrine is quite another affair. But surely it is poor criticism and worse morals to refuse to meet him on his own serious plane—to call him an obscenity-monger, a pornographer, a corrupter (God save the mark!) of public taste. It should require neither a very clear critical judgment nor a very tolerant attitude to clear him of all these false accusations. Whatever we think of his accomplishment, we must allow his stated intentions the respect we pay to honest words everywhere.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1929, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK
HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY BRUCE BLIVEN GEORGE SOULE
EDMUND WILSON STARK YOUNG R. M. LOVETT
T. S. MATTHEWS

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY WALDO FRANK
ALVIN JOHNSON E. C. LINDEMAN ROBERT LITTELL
LEWIS MUMFORD GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL
LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Two Decades of Negro Life

DURING the last twenty years the revolutionary changes that made the United States the world's foremost nation have brought the Negro the greatest progress since emancipation. He has now entered what has been called the era of opportunity, and is fast being accepted as a part of the nation's life.

Twenty years ago he was considered a drag on the country's progress, a permanent and essential inferior, and a being apart in American life. At that time, he had little confidence in himself, a strong feeling of inferiority, and no belief that he could organize his own people to secure his rights. The science of that day classed him as a lower order of man, his background was supposed to be that of a mere savage; and it was assumed that he had no history. Mobs lynched three Negroes a week. Peonage still continued in the lower South. Negroes there were disfranchised, and in the North were blind party-slaves. The United States Supreme Court had never passed on the Fourteenth Amendment: southern legislatures from time to time demanded its repeal, as well as that of the Fifteenth Amendment. Foreign immigration had forced Negroes out of the jobs that were traditionally theirs in the North. In the South, public sentiment and attempted legislation combined to take the skilled occupations from them. In fact, they had no appreciable place in the basic industries that made America great. Few Negro students were in the colleges, and few Negroes could be found in the learned professions. There was no Negro literature. Writers like Chestnutt and Dunbar were regarded as exceptions. Negro education in the public schools in the South was of the poorest. Statisticians were confident he was doomed to extinction by tuberculosis, crime, and inefficiency.

Today the Negro has powerful national organizations to safeguard his rights, stimulate his progress, and care for his needs. He is learning his own power. He has developed race pride. The science of today is on his side, indicating that there is no proof of essential inferiority on his part, nor unfitness to meet any demand of American life. Negro history is being taught in white and colored schools; Negro culture in Africa is at least somewhat understood and appreciated. Lynching in 1928, has dwindled to eleven for the whole year; peonage has lessened. The Negro now has councilmen in many cities, members of state legislatures, and even one Congressman in the United States Congress. The emancipation from blind partisanship goes forward bravely, Negroes vote in Democratic primaries in some southern states; and have won a decision in the United States Supreme Court, which declared unconstitutional their debarment from the Democratic primary. Ten thousand Negroes graduate each year from our colleges and universities. They have 45,000 teachers, 1,400 of whom are in institutions of higher learning. Negro novelists, essayists, and poets have given definite contributions to the literature of America. George Carver and Ernest Just, both Negroes, are regarded as great scientists. Broadway is not itself unless it has a Negro play. There are 3,500 Negro physicians and surgeons. More than a thousand Negroes are lawyers, among whom are several judges administering justice to both races.

Negroes own 700,000 homes, and possess $1,500,000,000 in wealth. They have ownership of one hundred million dollars of church property alone. Two hundred and thirty-two thousand Negroes own farms; 70,000 operate their own businesses. They have sixty life insurance companies, twenty-eight of these having on their books business worth $242,000,000.

The gloomy prophecies of the Negro's early extinction have not been justified; on the contrary, there has been a greater decrease in the death rate among Negroes than among any other group. Deaths from tuberculosis alone declined 42 percent between 1911 and 1922. The life expectancy of Negroes in the United States today is what that of whites was thirty years ago, and ahead of that of whites in many European countries. It is steadily improving, with more knowledge, better economic status, better public and private health service, and better environmental conditions. There is no reason to believe that the life expectancy of the Negro will not, in time, reach that of whites in this country.

The World War was the greatest occasion of this progress. Before 1915, comparatively few Negroes moved north, for the stream of immigrants from Europe left few chances to find jobs. The War stopped immigration temporarily, and legislation since the War has held it down to the bone. The result has been that about a million and a half Negroes have moved north since 1915. In the South, the rural Negroes took the place of those in the cities who had moved northward. Today, a quarter of all the Negroes in the country are in the North, and a third in cities. The number of Negro farmers, on the other hand, is actually decreasing.

When the Negro first came North, he entered the lowest sort of labor. Soon he found a place in semi-skilled work, then skilled work, and now he has become an important factor in the industrial life

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of America. The Ford factory in Detroit alone employs 17,000. Negroes are now working in chemical laboratories and steel mills; they are blowing glass, molding iron, and engaged in many other like industries. And most of this gain has come in the past twenty years.

City life and industrial work have made many changes, both in the Negro, and in the reaction of white people to him. The notion that he was unfitted for industry has been discredited; the claim that he was improvident is also going by the board. The South had denied him living wages and justified itself by saying that he would not work if his simple needs were supplied and a margin left. But a survey by the United States Labor Department showed that, in the industrial cities, Negroes were rapidly acquiring bank accounts. The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company alone has two and a half million Negro policy-holders.

In the rural South, many Negroes are not paid in money. They are given credit for supplies, and at the end of the year, a statement of their credit or debit is made out. Naturally, this gives them no chance to learn to manage money. Others are paid once a year, receiving whatever is left of their credit. In the Southern cities, Negro wages are below the usual scale; in the North, especially in industrial work, the Negro competes with white men and receives the same wage.

The actual number of Negroes earning wages is less today than it was ten years ago. But this is because many of the women who used to work beside the men in the fields have stopped working out, and are making homes for their families. The result is better living conditions for all. Child labor among Negroes also has greatly decreased, thanks to compulsory education and higher wages.

As a city dweller, the Negro is losing some of his traditional characteristics. He has already become quicker in thought and speech, as he has grown attuned to the city's tempo. He is more aggressive, and because of larger contacts and more knowledge of the accomplishments of his race, has acquired a greater race pride. He has more self-confidence and more regard for his appearance. He resents wrongs more quickly, and is not so easily imposed upon as his country brother.

The Negro industrial worker is also learning class consciousness. He is beginning to realize that he is one of a group, the workers of the world. He hears labor problems and labor organization discussed among his white fellows. He learns to associate with his white fellow workers on a basis of equality. And so it is that, after ten years of industrial work, the Negro is demanding admission to the unions of skilled workers. The unions—at first hostile—are beginning to recognize the growing power of the Negroes and to realize the necessity of including them in their ranks in order to accomplish their aims.

In the labor unions organized among unskilled workers, such as longshoremen and building laborers, Negroes are already found in large numbers. The higher trades, like carpentering and painting, are slow to accept Negroes, and the number among them is still small. There are some unions, like those of the wire-workers, telegraphers, and locomotive engineers, who refuse to accept Negroes.

The Negro workers are beginning to organize among themselves and then seek admission into the white groups. The Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, for example, has now been accepted by the American Federation of Labor. Even in the South, organized labor is seeing the necessity of including the Negro. A Negro organizer in Gastonia was actually protected from a mob not long ago by Southern white mill hands who had been organized.

A by-product of the Negroes' becoming industrialized and urbanized is the break-up of the plantation methods, with their credit system, peonage, and one crop. This will result in small farm holdings, diversified crops, and a new system of financing the farmers. It has already resulted in better treatment of Negroes, better schools, more justice in courts, better wage conditions, and greater privileges, in order to maintain a labor supply.

Still more drastic changes will come in the future. It is true that city life is hard on the Negroes' health during the period of readjustment. The temptations of the city, too, will take their toll: the increase in venereal disease among Negroes is partly a result of increase in city dwelling. Heavy industrial work may produce an increase in cardiac affections. Ultimately, however, his greater knowledge of sanitation and hygiene, the larger access to clinics and health agencies, and his higher standards of living will more than offset these adverse conditions.

The greatest gains of the Negro in the past twenty years have been in his economic status, the increase in education, the growth in self-confidence, the flowering of artistic and cultural accomplishments, and the winning of a higher place in the estimation of the Nation.

In education, the progress of Negro schools has been remarkable. Public schools everywhere in the South have improved in curricula, standards, equipment and buildings, although they are still very poor. Rosenwald schools have sprung up all over the South. Negroes themselves have raised four million dollars for these. There are four great educational centers, Howard University at Washington, now a government institution, Fisk at Nashville, with Meharry having a new laboratory and hospital; three colleges united to form a great university in Atlanta; and a merging of colleges and a hospital to provide a first-class university in New Orleans. Besides this, many states in the South are developing real state colleges for Negroes. The number of Negroes doing graduate work in America and in Europe is already large. Negro schools have endowments of about twenty millions.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Negro has gone far along the road to opportunity in the last twenty years, but there are many problems yet to be solved. There is the question of Negro housing. In many urban centers, persistent attempts have been made to force the Negro into the ghetto. The United States Supreme Court, in a case pressed by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, declared unconstitutional ordinances passed by cities to this end. Covenants and mob action have tried to do what law will not permit, with resultant friction and strife.

There is also the problem of caste proscription based on color, the general acceptance of which would be most undesirable in a democracy. There is the disfranchisement of millions of Negroes in the South through subterfuge and fraud; lynching; mobbing; injustice in courts; and discrimination in travel.

It is a long way yet before the Negro will reach the full goal of citizenship and opportunity. But his feet are on the right road and the review of the short period of twenty years clearly indicates what he can look forward to within a reasonable time.

ROBERT W. BAGNALL.

The X Plan in the Clothing Trade

FIVE years ago, Hart, Schaffner, and Marx, the largest manufacturer of men's clothing in the world, was forced to cut down its production drastically because of a slow market. Several shops were closed, and the rest seriously crippled. When business failed to revive in 1925, it became apparent that the lack of orders was not due to any temporary fluctuations in the trade, but to an actual change in the kind of clothes men were buying.

Since the War, men have tended to buy cheaper clothes than before. In spite of this, Hart, Schaffner, and Marx had persisted in spending millions of dollars in advertising high-priced clothes. But the retailers were finding it harder every day to sell suits at $45 or more, when the popular demand was for a $35 suit.

What the company needed was clearly a new type of suit, which could compete in the lower-priced markets; but to produce this meant radically cutting down production costs. The tailor shops and cutting room would have to be reorganized, labor saving machinery introduced, and wages lowered before the company could profitably turn out a cheaper line of clothes.

Unlike the Ford Motor Company, when it changed models, Hart, Schaffner, and Marx could not act without considering the interests of its employees. For fifteen years the company and the clothing workers' union had settled their disputes by a system of industrial law, under which the company and the union stood on an equal plane, so far as the chief labor relationships were concerned. The union had gained so much control, before 1924, that the company could make no important changes in the lay-out of the factories or in the type of machinery, without consulting officials of the union, nor could any change be made in wage rates without action by the rate committee upon which the union enjoyed equal representation with the company.

The company might have escaped from its difficulties, by repudiating its agreement with the union, but as it had been a pioneer in establishing industrial law in the clothing industry, and had profited by its action, its officials had no desire to take this step.

Eventually the initiative for a change came from the president of the union, and the labor manager of the company, who approached the company officials to discuss some means of dealing with unemployment. This conference was one among many that the union president engaged in throughout the men's clothing industry in 1924 and 1925, as the result of a new industrial policy which the union adopted, to help manufacturers adjust themselves to the changing market. As stated in the 1926 report of the General Executive Board of the union, "They were prepared to look into costs; to participate in the reorganization of the shops along less wasteful and more economical lines; to coöperate in the rapid and inexpensive settlement of all union issues; and to restrict those practices that had proved to be burdensome and costly." In the case of Hart, Schaffner and Marx, unemployment could be eliminated only by reviving the lost business, and this meant changes in production which would enable it to put a lower-priced garment on the market.

The president of the union and the officials of the company agreed to study the problem by setting up a small shop to experiment in the production of suits at the lowest possible cost consistent with the best interests of both parties. This was not an entirely new plan. The labor manager of the company and the president of the union had for several years considered the possibility of some such experiment, but business conditions had not given them a chance before to try it out.

The opening of this shop, in the spring of 1925 marked a new phase in the development of labor relations between Hart, Schaffner and Marx and the Amalgamated Union. Before this, the trade agreement, renewed every three years, had established a procedure of industrial law. Although this law had been highly profitable to both sides, it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would be stretching the truth to say that it had brought the company and the union into accord on the important question of making clothes. Within the framework of the agreement, the sharpest kind of dealings were carried on. The union acted on the theory that its success depended on its power to bargain with the firm, and that no step was too trivial to take if it added to that power. The company, on the other hand, guarded its prerogatives jealously against the encroachments of the union.

But when the X Plan was put into effect, both the company and the union made generous concessions, in their common desire to bring production and employment back to a healthy condition. The company recognized the union as a coöperating agent in production by giving it control in many matters that had always been associated with management. The job of keeping discipline among the workers was practically taken over by the union officials. The company cut down its staff of quality examiners, and turned over to the union the task of maintaining the established standards. The union also helped the company to design the new X-construction garment, and plan the lay-out of the X-shop. The company and the union together agreed upon the total labor cost of the X-garment, and the union distributed this sum among the operators as it saw fit. The union also made concessions to the company to promote efficiency in the new X-shop. Cherished customs of working were given up, and a generally lower level of piece rates was established, although it was hoped that the increase in production would keep the weekly earnings of the workers at their former level.

This sacrifice of established customs reveals more clearly than anything else what changes were brought about by the introduction of the X system. It was by establishing customs in the shops that the union had acquired much of its power over the company in the years that preceded the experimental shop; for, once a custom had been established, the Impartial Chairman would enforce it as a part of the industrial law. The workers were always eager to build up a body of customs, believing that the union's bargaining power depended on the extent to which it controlled the processes of production. The management was equally anxious to prevent the growth of customs, and the Impartial Chairman was kept busy deciding whether or not certain methods of procedure were customs, and, therefore, enforceable as part of the industrial law. By 1924, these customs had grown into a complicated network of restrictions on management, which, it is true, sometimes safe-guarded the workers, but often turned out to be a burden on both the company and the union, by slowing up production and making it hard to change established methods of working. Under the X plan, the union won, at a single stroke, much of the control that had been its aim in building up this network of customs, and since they were no longer necessary as a war measure against the management, they were eliminated in the new shop.

Soon after the new X-style garment was put on the market, orders for it began to pour in, and the experimental shop could not turn out suits fast enough to meet the demand. It was plain to everybody that the lower-priced suit meant large orders for the company and steady work for the people. The dissatisfaction that had been felt among the people whenever lower piece rates had been established vanished when they found that the steady flow of work made up for the lower rates, and in some cases brought higher earnings than before. News of the experiment seeped into the other shops, which were still suffering from unemployment, and the workers began to urge their union representatives to get an extension of the X-construction system. The company was ready to turn over the production of the X-garments to the other shops as fast as orders made the change possible, and as the demand for the lower priced clothes has increased by leaps and bounds since 1925, the X plan has been steadily expanded, until today most of the company's business is in that type of clothes.

The short time that the X plan has been in operation does not permit more than a suggestion of some of the results it has brought about. Thanks to it the company has made financial gains in the past three years through the production of popular-priced clothes at a low cost. For although the company has always produced on an enormous scale, it had never, until the introduction of the X plan, used real mass production methods. Small and medium sized orders for suits and overcoats made up most of the company's business before 1925. Under this system, the costs of manufacturing were high, compared with those under the present X plan, where most of the work is made up of lots of twenty or more garments which pass rapidly through the cutting room and the tailor shops. Before the introduction of the X plan, the company supervised the work of each section closely as the garments passed along the production line. This required a large number of examiners in each factory. Under the present system, the company subjects the garments to a thorough examination after they are completed and before they leave the factory, but the section examiners are becoming less necessary as the workers themselves assume greater responsibility for quality. In 1924, one of the tailor shops producing 700 coats a day employed twenty-five section examiners. At the present time a tailor shop turning out 1,800 coats a day employs only thirteen section examiners, and even this number will probably be cut down. This reduction of the examining force has meant large savings for Hart, Schaffner, and Marx, and at the same time the quality of workmanship has not suffered, for the unions have themselves disciplined their members whose work has fallen short of the quality standards set up by the company. Undesirable and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

costly customs have been done away with, and since the unions have taken over the responsibility for discipline, the cause of many of the interruptions of production that were common before 1925 no longer exists. The lay-out of the shops has also been altered to speed up the flow of work, and new operations introduced and old ones eliminated wherever more efficient results could be obtained by doing so.

The first return to the union for its share in the experiment has been steady work and increased earnings. In fixing the piece rates on the new garment, the union officials generally recast the rates that had been previously in force. The rates on some operations were reduced by the union deputies and others were raised. But on the whole, increased production has meant higher weekly earnings.

The cutting room provided the most serious problem that developed out of the new method of working. The greatest savings as a result of the X plan were found to lie here, and hence it was here that the adverse effects of increased efficiency were felt most acutely by the workers. Instead of individual garments, or small lays of three or four, the cutter now worked chiefly on lays of twelve or more garments. Furthermore, much of the cutter's work in planning the lay-out of his patterns on any particular job was taken over by the clerical staff, and the cutter found from the ticket that accompanied his cloth just how to proceed, without the time-consuming calculations that were formerly a part of his work. Unlike the situation in the tailor shops, where the increased volume of work more than compensated the men for the readjustment required by the X system, the increase in efficiency in the cutting room was so effective in saving labor that only half as many cutters were needed as before. Consequently a large part of the cutting force had to be eliminated, and the Trade Board, in a decision on March 18, 1926, permitted the discharge of 150 men. Each cutter discharged was paid $500 from a fund to which the company contributed $50,000 and the union $25,000, from its unemployment insurance fund. In the 1926 report of the General Executive Board of the union, the following statement of the cutters was made: "The plan was received with general satisfaction, as yielding a fuller volume of employment to those who remain, as tiding the released cutters over the period of adjustment to new jobs—and as affording the company relief from the disadvantage of overcrowded sections."

In the 1928 report of the General Executive Board of the union, considerable attention was given to their new industrial policy. General approval of the policy is expressed in the following words: "While it appears to have had its most spectacular results in the well known X-construction experiment of Hart, Schaffner, and Marx, it has been no less successful throughout the market."

The whole policy is summed up in the report as follows, "In substance, our organization has been assuming a larger share of the functions of management. Vague terms, like union control, have under our arrangements, with many manufacturers, been translated into stern reality. Already many of the functions of supervision and management have, in spots, been taken over by the union. The savings that have been effected by this procedure have gone to raise the standards and income of our members and to increase the business of unionized firms. At the same time, to a large extent as a result of these methods, the union has become more indispensable to the industry than it has ever been."

THOMAS W. HOLLAND.

The Battle of Hollywood

THE long-anticipated fight of the Actors' Equity Association with the motion picture producers has begun in dead earnest.

In Hollywood, excited groups of actors stand at the street corners and in cafés. Vituperative epithets are bandied freely back and forth: "Traitor!" "Scab!" "Dirty renegade!" Motor cars—from antiquated Fords to new Cadillacs—carry large stickers: "EQUITY." Display cards in half a hundred shop and café windows announce: "We solicit the trade of members of the Actors' Equity Association." Merchants and restaurateurs offer 5, 10, and 20 percent discount to all Equity members. Along Hollywood Boulevard, placards read: "Field Committee of the Actors' Equity." In the central headquarters—second floor up, above the Woolworth store—and in the branch offices, there is the feverish activity of committees and sub-committees: Relief, Ways and Means, Investigating, Employment, Membership, etc.—twenty-eight in all.

At the studios, whispering, and counter-whispering. Covert expressions of sympathy for Equity: open expressions of derision and fiery antagonism. A hundred tempting offers are turned down by loyal Equity members, refusing anything but the new Equity contract. There is serious interference in the production schedules of several studios. The Producers' Association—yes *they* have an organization—maintains its intransigent attitude, ignoring Equity's demands, in meetings behind closed doors. A dozen small independent producers have acceded to Equity.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Film papers run column upon column of Equity news—news of meetings, manifestoes, deserters, recent adherents, rumors of every kind. Los Angeles daily papers—The Times, The Examiner, The Herald—consecrate valuable space to vilifying organized actors. A Hollywood radio station has been engaged by Equity. At the last moment the engagement was cancelled—no reason assigned. Another station has been engaged.

On July 10, a huge throng of more than 3,000 Equity members and sympathizers gathered at the American Legion Stadium—the sixth of a series of meetings. George Arliss, Reginald Denny, Jetta Goudal, Ann Harding, Louis Wolheim, Ben Lyon, George Fawcett, Helen Ware, Leo Carillo, Mae Murray, Emma Dunn, Claude Gillingwater were on the platform, or in the audience. At the request of President Frank Gillmore, sixty-five chorus girls stood up. That morning they had walked out of Warner Brothers', First National and Paramount studios, in obedience to the mandate of their organization, the Chorus Equity, allied to the Actors' Equity. A storm of applause greeted them. Hats and handkerchiefs were waved and thrown into the air: the entire audience rose in acclamation. President Gillmore called the girls "the shock troops of Equity." One speech after another was delivered: "Stand firm." "We must win because our cause is just." "We are fighting for the principle of Equity, for the right to have a voice in the conduct of our profession." "Never before has there been such a truly remarkable uprising."

Enthusiasm surged up in waves. The names of the few deserters, who have accepted non-Equity contracts since the zero hour, were read in dead silence. Then from all parts of the stadium, a roar of disapproval, of hate—catcalls, hisses, groans, shouting. . . .

What is it all about? Why such a disturbance of the serenity of this city of make-believe? The public, even locally, is confused. The newspapers, with few exceptions, print only stupidly biased comment—statements of individual stars and theatrical producers opposed to Equity: inadequate or false reports of meetings, or no reports at all: lists of actors opposing Equity's stand, many of which are blatantly false.

What does Equity want? Merely this: Recognition of its organization and equitable contracts. The new Equity contract, as contrasted to the old standard studio agreement, provides for a forty-eight hour week, with time and a half for overtime; only paid rehearsals; actors engaged on a weekly basis, to be paid for the entire week, irrespective of whether they work every day or not; no contracts to be issued for "a part" in a picture, without stipulation as to the stopping date; all Sunday work to be construed as overtime, and not more than eight hours to be permitted in all; only all-Equity casts for talking pictures[1]; the working day to start the moment the actor reports at the studio. There are many other stipulations, but these are the most important—for the actor. In view of the hopeless abuses suffered by the film player—particularly the character actor, the small-part player and the atmosphere people—and the vagueness of the present standard studio agreement, and also in view of the inability of the individual player to seek redress without jeopardizing his livelihood—these demands are certainly reasonable.

Six months ago, the Equity Council sent a questionnaire to all members of Equity living in Hollywood and its vicinity: Were they or were they not in favor of the Equity shop in talking pictures? The response was overwhelmingly in the affirmative—ten to one.

On June 3, of this year, President Gillmore notified each member that on and after June 5, only Equity contracts were to be accepted in talking pictures. Contract players, already signed up, were to continue working, but after the expiration of their time only Equity agreements would be acceptable.

Many meetings have been held—each one larger and more enthusiastic than the preceeding. A thousand new members have been enrolled since June 5. On July 11 alone, more than one hundred cowboy players—80 percent of the cowboys used in pictures—joined Equity in a body. The Equity Council has voted $10,000 to carry on the fight, and pledged an additional $10,000 when necessary. Individual contract players are donating a portion of their salaries to be distributed among their less fortunate comrades if in need. The American Federation of Labor, to which the Actors' Equity is allied, has pledged its wholehearted support. Many unions throughout the country have asked for the privilege of assisting in the struggle. It is true that some Equity members, contrary to the mandate of their association, have signed non-Equity contracts. They have been suspended from the organization, and their names are anathema to loyal adherents.

The cameramen, the studio electricians and carpenters, have already powerful organizations of their own, all auxiliaries of the American Federation of Labor. And now the film-cutters, the sound engineers, the costume people, the chauffeurs and draymen are in the process of organization. Unquestionably a victory for Equity would mean the complete unionization of the film industry—a consummation devoutly to be wished. A more equitable distribution of the enormous spoils accruing from the production of motion pictures is inevitable. The star, the director, the producer and the stockholder have been consistently kind to themselves. Now the supporting casts and others connected with the industry are demanding what is no more than their due.

[1] Equity is in no sense of the word a "closed shop." Anyone can join the association, at least as a junior member, provided he can prove he is working as an actor.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This attempt at unionizing the film players is no sporadic gesture. Equity has been agitating and laying its plans for fully ten years. The sudden prevalence of talking pictures, making the use of actors with stage experience almost indispensable, has merely brought matters to a head. For there are very few stage people who are not members of Equity. The fight of 1919—the Battle of Broadway—when Equity gained its first momentous victory, was as child's play compared to this herculean conflict—the Battle of Hollywood. And the battle has just begun. On one side are massed millions of investments, the producers, the newspapers, the union-hating Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association; on the other, three thousand determined actors, backed by the American Federation of Labor. The result is in the lap of the gods.

SOMERSET LOGAN.

Hollywood, Calif.

Rudy Vallée

God's Gift to Us Girls

STANDING room only. That's all there ever is for Rudy Vallée, New York's treasure, the country's newest and nicest beloved. But why?

The Brooklyn Paramount is a leviathan amongst movie houses. The first floor shames the Champs de Mars. Balconies rise endlessly to a remote ceiling. Gilt scrolls and gimcracks glare and glitter all around. In contrast the stage is very simple. Rudy Vallée's revue is on. This week we're pretending to be doughboys. A large orchestra, a nondescript group of male walk-ons, a funny man with an unfinished sort of face, a girl whose voice is strong rather than beautiful, and Rudy himself, make up the cast. The plot—if revues do have plots—is of no importance either to actors or audience. The orchestra plays occasionally, and their jazz is no worse than any other jazz. The jokester says things that make you think you might laugh, if you put your mind to it. The girl, who is irksome because she is neither young, nor pretty, hands doughnuts to the "boys" and sings a lush love-song.

And now the fun begins. The song—of the I'm-crazy-about-you kind—demands that the lady cotton up to and cleave unto one gentleman after another. In the course of this vocal, and uninspiring, flirtation, she babbles the you're-the-only-man line to Rudy and encircles him with her masterful arms. Rudy is unquestionably an actor. At first, he seems embarrassed and confused; the audience giggles. Then he looks about like a shamefaced little boy, and, satisfying himself that he and she are alone beneath the stars (as I believe she is assuring him at the top of her lungs, betimes) he warms to his task, grins, and hugs her quite convincingly. The audience, except for the few uncomfortable males present, goes mad. A murmur of delight rises like a tidal wave, becomes an envious moan, pants into a yearning sob, and dies down. The revue continues—but, alas, drearily. One wishes that it would end; or that Rudy Vallée would do something besides lead his jazz-lads, carelessly, with one hand. We wish he would either get into the spirit of the thing or get off the stage. His shy, I-can't-imagine-why-I'm-here pose is tiring. We almost decide to go home.

Suddenly Rudy picks up a megaphone, stands quietly at the corner of the stage, and begins to sing. The audience holds its breath, in joy, in adoration. The orchestra plays softly, slowly. He has chosen "I Kiss Your Hand, Madame." It was a wise choice. His voice is low, pleasant, natural. It slides along—that is the only way to describe it. He misses the beat of the orchestra, and drops into a slower tempo, with a rhythm of his own. The words drift from the megaphone like a caress, a *billet doux* for each gasping female in the vast theater. The music is charming—thanks to Vienna—and the words are not so gummy as those we are accustomed to. He sings the piece twice. And he is good. We needn't quibble about that. Crooning "I Kiss Your Hand, Madame," he is even better than good. He is swell. When he stops, the audience's breath, held in an exquisite agony of waiting, is unleashed. And with it comes pounding applause. The woman in the next seat murmurs, "Isn't he the sweetest ever?" Another, behind us, sighs, "That's too lovely to be true." His only other contributions to the gayety of the evening are two more songs: "I'll Get By" and "You Are the Girl of My Dreams." But the first fine frenzy is lost. He should have stuck to "I Kiss Your Hand, Madame."

The audience, however, does not slacken in its turbulent enthusiasm. It is enraptured, fanatical. It has been carried up Parnassus on this insinuating, wooing voice. He is their darling, their Song Lover. He is the best yet. Rudy Valentino wasn't in it. The dead are forgotten, anyhow. Nobody's in it. Give us Rudy Vallée. Give us this tall slender, simple boy, with his blond, wavy hair, his tanned face, his blue eyes, and his gentle voice that makes love so democratically to everyone. He is, indeed, the best yet!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It has been reported that, in one of his revues, Rudy appeared nattily clad in a white linen suit, in splendid solitude against black velvet back-drops. Stealing John Barrymore's thunder, neatly. And when he stepped forth, so young, so beautiful, so calm, the house trembled with the ecstasy of his worshippers. A New York department store, which indiscreetly advertised a sale of Vallée records, quivered and shook, tottering on its foundations, so great a stampede was caused by Rudy's luring, if only mechanical, voice. John Wanamaker's invited Rudy in to sing one morning at ten-thirty—a forlorn hour, at best. The crowd which surged in to hear, see, and clamor its devotion made the fall gatherings, in the Yale Bowl, seem a wistful handful. All the city papers—and especially the ubiquitous Daily Mirror—have paid their compliments, or snarled, in the direction of Mr. Vallée. One cannot ignore such a fervently acclaimed personage. And finally, Vanity Fair—that Salute to Success—in its current issue, runs a full page picture of Rudy, megaphone at mouth, saxophone at side. (For, of course, he plays the saxophone. So many people do.) This photograph portrays our hero in a mood both Byronic and relaxed. The old-style jazz-singer, the speed maniac of St. Vitus movements, has passed on to a better world. Rudy Vallée sets another fashion: tasteful simplicity in dress—consider the blatant chequered habits of our former vaudeville hits—dignity, and blond youthfulness. It is not to wonder, particularly. After all, we have been over-fed on sleek, dark movie villains who turned out to be, to our growing disgust, heroes in the end. And perhaps Colonel Lindbergh unwittingly started the vogue of men with nordic physiognomies.

The only surprise in this human cyclone of success is his speaking voice and choice of words. His audiences in Brooklyn are not the "cultured minority." Professors, philanthropists, artists, and philosophers do not gather in that ugly theater at Flatbush and DeKalb Avenues. Rudy's followers are just a movie audience. And to them Rudy Vallée, in a carefully modulated, well-bred voice, announces that the next act is an acrobatic stunt arranged by some Germans "whose dexterity and skill I am sure you will find worthy of admiration"—or words to that academic effect. It doesn't look so startling on paper, but it fair bowls you over in the Brooklyn Paramount Theater.

What can be the reason for Rudy Vallée's meteoric rise? Is it subconscious nationalism on the part of thousands of women? For Rudy is undoubtedly the personification of Clean Young American Manhood. Is it due to the much-vaunted American energy? Do we revel in burning up our cells on hero-worship? But if that were the cause for Mr. Vallée's popularity, why did New York, to say nothing of the innumerable radio owners throughout our lovely land, decide to pin their passionate affection on Rudy rather than on someone else? Is Rudy's voice the key to the riddle? It might be, because it is a respectable voice, and it is a relief to have a man sing like a human being and not like an hydraulic drill. Perhaps the secret lies in the Vallée type of beauty, which reminds one of the Lifebuoy Soap advertisements, or the Sloan's Liniment pictures in their better moments. That too is possible, but radio audiences cannot see their hero's face. No. It would seem that American women—this has all the drawbacks of any generalization—want a beau. Their husbands are busy earning the money that sends the ladies to the movies, or buys them radios. The poor men can't be expected to come home from work, hurry through a shower, gussy up in white linens, and start singing in a languid, cajoling way, "I Kiss Your Hand, Madame." They can't be expected to, but the ladies want it, anyhow. And Rudy fills the bill. He is perfect proof of that good old axiom: supply and demand. He is young, he is handsome, and tenderly, coaxingly he sings love-songs to every romance-silly female in these U. S. A. And *that* is that.

MARTHA GELLHORN.

Washington Notes

BY the time this piece is printed the recess of Congress will be nearly over and the bell about to ring for the second round of the great 1929 tariff fight—if fight it really turns out to be. Of that there is at this time quite some doubt, despite the war whoops and tom-tom playing of the various and sundry minorities who help constitute the cast in the current political comedy. The first round was in the House; the second will be in the Senate; if there is to be any heavy fighting at all, it will take place in the third—which is to say, in the Conference Committee. In the House and the Senate there has been only shadow boxing. It is in the third round that the real licks are struck, if any. As the situation begins to "clarify itself," which is the pleasing and profound way our leading publicists habitually refer to situations impenetrably cloudy to them—as the situation begins to clarify itself, I find myself swinging completely away from the belief that any potent political issue can be made of the tariff in either the congressional elections of 1930, or the presidential election of 1932. Notwithstanding the raucous cries of the progressives and the blatant insincerities of Democrats of the Pat Harrison type, to whom the country as a whole pays no attention, I am much afraid that the politically explosive possibilities of the tariff bill will peter out in a most disappointing way. There are several reasons for this. One is that in its final form the bill will not be as bad as the new Democratic publicity (which, much as I dislike to say the wet-blankety word, is being somewhat overdone by the freshly organized and enthusiastic Shouse-Michelson bureau) is proclaiming and predicting. Another is that the bill will not only be much less outrageous than the Democrats hope, think, and pray, but it will actually be considerably better than it was when it passed the House with its ninety-seven undesired and undesirable amendments—amendments to which the House leaders and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Ways and Means Committee were opposed, but which they were helpless to prevent. A large number of these amendments will be knocked down and not a few of them dragged out. Such, I regret to report, is the real prospect. Such, it seems agreed, is the direction in which we are drifting—a development that threatens to turn sour the whole pot of Democratic propaganda which the new "hands at the helm" have been so earnestly stirring.

In a previous article I pointed out that the Hoover position was such as to make it altogether likely that in the end he would get approximately what he wanted in the way of a tariff bill, as he got approximately what he wanted in the way of a farm-relief bill. The more you reflect upon his position, the more you realize its power, and the surer you are that he is not going to sit still and let a bill be put over on him which is personally offensive to his publicly expressed promise of a limited revision, and calculated to react disastrously upon him and his party. To believe otherwise is to believe that the efficient Herbert is both stupid and inert. Actually, no one thinks him either. Actually, as demonstrated by the interesting modification he has brought about in the views of Old Guard Senators, touched upon in this place two weeks ago, he has shown an intelligent activity in the whole tariff business, the more effective because it has been so unostentatious. He has played one House against the other with a skill far from amateurish. He has kept his eye on the ball all the time. He has been fully aware of the general journalistic reaction against the House bill, and has used the same to strengthen his position. He has known as well as the most seasoned tariff manipulator in the Senate that tariff bills are always written in the Conference Committee; and that is where he expects to put on the real White House pressure. The process of softening the hard-boiled, high-tariff Senators of his own party is merely preliminary. Altogether I think that, despite the apparent confusion caused by the Democratic denunciations, and the Borah-Brookhart blasts, Herbert has the tariff situation fairly well in hand. Of course, the truth is that, in the matter of the tariff, Mr. Hoover is very much nearer the sort of protectionist Borah is than the sort Smoot or Reed or Mellon or Moses is; and there is always the veto, the use of which in this case would be extremely popular. Taking into consideration these and other facts it seems to me more or less simple-minded to conceive of Mr. Hoover allowing himself to be ruined by the tariff in the way Mr. Taft was ruined. I am sorry for the Democrats. I greatly sympathize with them in their efforts to get a tariff bill so rotten that a revolution will result and a great popular upheaval ensue. I am sorry because I would dearly love to see a political revolution—we need one very badly—and I am all for a popular upheaval. But it won't happen. At least I do not think so. The only reason I have for doubting my judgment in this matter is that I find practically all the more pontifical of our political publicists, whose number in Washington is rapidly increasing, in complete accord with me. That makes me think there is some mistake somewhere.

But enough of the tariff, which is I think, the world's dullest subject. Let's talk of something else—for example, the so-called power trust. Very recently it was brought to the front by Governor Roosevelt in his assault on the Morgan merger of public utilities in New York. Last week from the progressive camp came a sharp attack on Mr. Hoover for his failure to get as excited about the power trust propaganda as he had over the proposal to push prohibition propaganda into the schools. He was called "tender-eyed" toward the power people. Perhaps he is—I do not know. What I do know, however, is that before his administration is very much older he will have to say or do something pretty definite on this subject. He will not be able to evade it. In my judgment, it is apt to overshadow prohibition and everything else in the next national campaign. There are many signs to confirm this idea. In the regular session of Congress which begins in December, a heavy barrage will be opened on the power company activities, and it will, I think, be fairly continuous for some time to come. The effort to control newspapers secretly, the indefensible nature of the propaganda methods, and the growth of these giant holding companies, combine to make just such another political issue as was made by the railroads twenty years ago.

It is natural to assume that the Democratic and progressive attitude will be openly hostile to the holding companies, will be against the big mergers and will be for much more rigid regulation. It is true that Mr. Hoover has not as yet, in any public way, given the least indication of his feelings on this question. His intimates deny vigorously that he is "tender-eyed" toward power. They say that he believes in regulated monopoly for public utilities within limited areas. He is further represented as feeling that while their propaganda is outrageous, the power combinations so far effected have done no economic damage. There is no popular outcry from the consumer about electric rates, electricity being one commodity which is cheaper now than before the War. These things, it is contended by the Hoover intimates, are facts to which only demagogues are blind. Nevertheless, they concede that the size of the holding companies constitutes a real national problem. Despite the Hoover belief that the size of the merger is not important so long as the principle of competition is preserved, and despite local regulation by state commissions, nearly all the "Hoover boys" agree there is peril not only for the investors, but for the public, in the way these companies are formed, in the manner of their financing, and in their perfect freedom from federal contronl. "The Chief," say the Hoover boys, "is studying it." The Chief, in my judgment, had better study it because the Chief is going to hear so much about the power trust in the next year or two that he will have to have an answer of some sort. He will hear about power long after the present tariff clatter has died down and been forgotten. It will, I believe, be the one string harped upon between now and that remote date when the Law Enforcement Commission reports and recommends. Mr. Hoover will not have to take a power trust stand in the special session, but he will certainly have to take one long before the regular session is through. And while it is all right to be "economically sound," if they ask my advice, which they will not, the Hoover boys will do what they can to keep the "Chief" from taking any stand that will cause than trenchant phrase, "tender-eyed," to stick.

T. R. B.

Washington.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From a Country Notebook

WHAT was it that this country butcher shop reminded me of—the dark little shop off the Main Street, with its one or two hunks of musty bologna and a rack of vegetables facing the butcher's block, wizened oranges, sear spring scallions, wrinkled carrots, and an assortment of cabbage hearts that looked a little like mouldy skulls, newly removed from the graveyard? What was it? Could it be similar shops in the Catskills or the Poconos, buried in a boy's memory and now roused by a sordid association? No: what came back suddenly was a little Tyrolean village shortly after the War, when the currency was not merely depressed, but in a state of nervous prostration, and such goods as were shown in the shops were far more emaciated than the population. Yes, that was it: a few dried-up sausages and some knotty green apples had been the vestiges of a prosperous rural economy, and just as in Austria there were two standards of value and two stocks of goods, those which could be purchased by strangers and those which were available to the inhabitants, so, in America, there was a similar gap between the metropolis and the countryside. These worn-out vegetables in the butcher shop were, in fact, the left-overs of the metropolitan table, poorer in quality than they would have been in Paddy's Market. Small wonder that gasoline stations and rooms for transients are increasing in every village. Having no basis of its own, the country is tempted to horn in on the metropolitan racket: a method of ensuring its existence by, quaintly, committing suicide.

We were discussing Stuart Chase's "The Two Hour War," and were getting what little consolation we could out of the fact that the big cities would be doomed first, and that their plans for increasing population and property values to the point of super-saturation might be abruptly and ironically terminated by a few whiffs of deadly gas. I daresay that in a hundred rooms, this same night, intelligent men and women were quietly probing the same question, and that more than one restless soul, before he settled to sleep, asked himself what he had in common with a race which could plan such comprehensive murders—if, indeed, he did not try to decide, more specifically, what his attitude would be if another war broke out. Obviously, the gentlemen who are actively planning this holocaust should either be locked in asylums, or committed to homes for the feeble-minded: yet we know that they are allowed at large, and some of them are even permitted to advise and train the young. Are there not enough sane men left, we asked ourselves, to form a posse and round these maniacs up? Or do we all suffer from sadisms and masochisms which make us either welcome the opportunity to inflict unlimited destruction, or accept, with beatitude, the role of being exterminated? The dangerous part of the situation is that fear is not a deterrent to war, but an incitement: a nervous man is always tempted to pull the trigger in order to relieve the unbearable tension; and one is not sure but that a forthright attack upon the horrors of the next war might not hasten the occasion.

We have jumped from an era of bad roads, that led, fairly often, through interesting country, into an era of good roads that begin in one big city and get lost in the traffic jumble of another, leaving a rapid swathe of dreariness and inanity in between. The person who has achieved this triumph is the road engineer. His idea of a good road is a metalled surface at least two hundred feet wide, screened on each side with signboards advertising tires, standardized hotels with servidors, fly screens, and sunburn ointment: if, in an imperfect world, his sublime plans are not completely effectuated, he still dreams of a time when multiple-decked highways will decrease the running time between the canned politeness and boilerplate menus of one hotel and the similar commodities unctuously offered by another. The road engineer has an unerring eye for picking out the dullest landscapes in the countryside, and by expensively grading or cutting through the few contours that would make the journey interesting, he achieves mathematical simplicity, if nothing else; to him the white ribbon of concrete is a greater work of art than any object it passes. Among all the devices for blasting the landscape and making the country permanently uninhabitable—the forest-cutting of the lumber company, the soil-mining of the bad farmer, the sub-divisions of the speculative realtor—the work of the road engineer easily stands first. He has taken a necessary function and elevated it into a dangerous nuisance. By his monotonous and expensive straight lines, his costly grades and fills, his contempt for natural scenery, he has done much to equalize competition between the motor and the railroad train; and in his plans for national trunk line highways he has fought valiantly on the side of urban congestion. The road engineer, in short, knows everything that is to be known about highway transportation—except why roads exist, and what they are good for.

The art of cooking is the business of chefs and literary men, and in America they have shamefully neglected their business. Cooking is the great test of our power to absorb other cultures and to further our own: but so far, our Americanism is that form of snobbish restriction which praises the ineptitudes as well as the virtues of the past, and seeks to erase the foreigner's indigenous culture by forcing him to eat, under the penalty of starvation and ostracism, desiccated breakfast foods, colonies of the lower vegetable organisms, and metaphysical abstractions called vitamines and mineral salts. Under the leadership of the woman's magazine, abetted by our most popular cook-books, the art of cookery has been largely reduced to that of table garniture: and a feast for the eyes has supplanted sound food for the stomach. The two chief resources of the American cook are almost unknown in classic cookery, particularly in their pure form, namely, whipped cream and marshmallow paste. I have sat down at a dinner of the local gentry in the Middle West, and have been scarcely able to satisfy myself with a single masculine flavor in the whole meal: whipped cream swam in the soup, preserved peaches, without spice or vinegar, slobbered over the meat, marshmallow whip inundated the already sweet potatoes, whipped cream pirouetted on top of the salad, and, in the state of nausea in which I finally finished the meal, it seemed to me that the desert was one huge morass of whipped cream. The one redeeming flavor might have been the cup of black coffee; and this was vile, as only percolator coffee, that other great device of liberated womanhood, can be vile.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A country which would swallow such food would swallow anything. Is it any wonder that political buncombe, war propaganda, and advertising quackery all slip down without a protest?

LEWIS MUMFORD.

Bricks without Straw

I

Because you have been my body's transient guest,
Known for a time my lips' soft urgency,
The warm and moving passion of my breast,
You hold too long your light-won sovereignty.
The inn's not empty, many come and pass,
Wine flows, and there is laughter as before;
But one has scratched a heart upon the glass,
And dug too deep a name beside the door.

And scrub and scrape and polish as I may,
These stand. No rite of housewifery dispels
These memoranda of an idle day,
These footnotes that you thought so little of.
My heart denies you, but my treacherous cells
Tremble and cry aloud. Can this be love?

II

I do not hate you that your easy lips
Woke fires they could not satisfy nor quench,
Nor that between the turnings of two quips
You had what you might have of any wench;
Neither for falsehood nor for broken pledge,
Not that you left me when I bade you go,
Nor that your wit had malice for its edge.
These were yourself, my dear, I loved you so.

But could I hate you, it would be for this:
There are such things as cannot be unsaid,
And you, who might have stopped them with a kiss,
Baited me with your tenderness instead.
My heart beat in your hand for you to see,
And all your life you will lightly pity me.

III

Protest and argue as I may and will,
Deride our hour as trivial and brief,
The stubborn fact remains: I love you still,
And to admit it now is sweet relief.
Sweet to proclaim, as lovers will forever,
Dull streets still bloom for me where you have been,
And things you said, not kind or even clever,
I treasure for the tones you said them in.

And should I, as I shall not, meet with you,
Though cool my scorn, my smile however proud,
I should be trembling as I used to do,
My startled heart be drumming all too loud.
Where if not here, O Sages, will you find
Proof of how matter triumphs over mind?

C. C. WILSON.

CORRESPONDENCE

Dr. Calhoun and Brookwood

SIR: The expulsion of Arthur Calhoun from Brookwood Labor College is an event of grave omen in the history of labor education in the United States. The particulars of the case are in no way as important as the general significance of the gesture. It is a sorry pass that radicals have come to these days in the repudiation of the very principles that they have claimed to live by, and which they have extolled as their fighting faith. When capitalist institutions pursue such a cut-throat policy, we are ridden with wrath—but are not surprised. But when a "labor college" with progressive, if not radical, aims repeats this same maneuver, we are ashamed.

For many of us, Brookwood stood out as the one significant experiment in labor education in America. The American Federation of Labor has throttled almost all other labor colleges that pass under that name in various cities in the country; compromise to the point of surrender has been necessary in most of these institutions in order that the colleges could survive at all. Brookwood, however, always remained as an institution which refused to be institutionalized. It stood for independence in workers' education, and for that freedom in instruction which saved it from the paralyzing hand of dogma. In its annual conferences on Workers' Education, prior to this year, it invited left-wingers as well as right, and always allowed a member of the Communist party to speak as well as participate in the general discussion of the conference. This was of the essence of that fair play, that democracy of attitude, for which Brookwood stood. During this past year, at the annual conference, this stand was deserted. No Communist speaker was allowed to be present (Dorothy Gary, however managed to get in), and Arthur Calhoun himself refused to attend because the plan was to exclude Communists. This new tactic meant the beginning of a new policy. While before Brookwood had fought for the right of all sides to have their say in the matter of workers' education, for democracy instead of dictatorship, in other words, it now decided for the right of one side, or rather of those sides that it favored, to dominate the discussion to the exclusion of the others.

In a few words, as Dr. Calhoun has well stated, where Brookwood had once sought to teach its students "how to think," it will now instruct them in "what to think." The expulsion of Calhoun, in line with this new policy, was inevitable. If Dr. Calhoun taught the students "what to think," it would not be in line with what the college wished them to think. Hence, the impossibility of his continued presence at the institution.

From the point of view of its new policy, which is directly aimed against left-wing programs in its advocacy of so-called progressive ones, the action of Brookwood in expelling Calhoun is legitimate. It is its change of policy that is disastrous. It signifies the downfall of independent labor education in the United States. No longer have we an institution that can boast of its defense of freedom in radical instruction. In fact, we have something here that is even worse. We have an example of the futility of the cry for democracy in education. We have an illustration of how impossible it is even for a workers' institution to maintain freedom in its educational policy. We have a clear reversion to the tactics of dictatorship and not democracy in this act. After all, the exercise of dictatorship has no intrinsic connection with a specific party or country, but is an action of fact, practised even where denied. The Communists are avowed and honest in their stand toward dictatorship. However much one may deplore the necessity of dictatorship in contemporary society, one cannot but admire the candor of the Communists in their announcement of their stand in its favor. What one cannot admire is the practice of dictatorship under the name of democracy, and the attack upon others for a tactic that one employs oneself.

Mr. Muste, who, prior to this gesture, deserved much praise for what he had tried to achieve at Brookwood, has very explicitly stated that the issue is "that Dr. Calhoun wishes to commit Brookwood to a Communist policy." But Brookwood fights Dr. Calhoun not with ideas but with force—the force of dictatorship expressing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

itself in the form of expulsion. But what makes the situation even more serious is the fact that, as Dr. Calhoun himself states he "is not a part of the Communist party movement," and never has been, and it is only his ideas that present danger to the situation. Knowing Dr. Calhoun personally, I am aware of something that everyone else who has known him at all is equally aware of, and that is that he has not essentially changed his position in the last four years. Since that is the case it is perfectly fair to ask, Why is it that it should be just this year that he should be expelled? He held the same views last year. Why was he not expelled then? The only answer is that something has happened at Brookwood this year. A change of policy! A new affiliation! The affiliation, as Dr. Calhoun himself points out, is with the Council for Progressive Labor Action. That Brookwood has a right to affiliate wherever it wills no one can deny, but when such affiliation resuks in such a revolution in policy as to make it go back on its entire ideal of independent workers' education, it opens itself to the condemnation of every liberal and radical in the United States. Such surrender is nothing short of a great betrayal.

V. F. CALVERTON.

New York City.

SIR: There has been no dictatorial action by a college president or "an outside Board of Trustees" or by anyone else in the Calhoun case. Dr. Calhoun's colleagues on the Brookwood faculty unanimously, reluctantly, and after lengthy conferences with him, reached the conclusion that because of his stand on Brookwood policy plus certain serious difficulties arising from his temperament, they were unable to work with him any longer. As Dr. Calhoun insisted on making an issue of it, they reported their conclusion to the Brookwood Board of Directors. Of course, it is conceivable that they were all mistaken, and Dr. Calhoun in the right. It would seem difficult, however, to imagine a less dictatorial procedure.

Dr. Calhoun was not "expelled" from Brookwood. Fully two years ago he insisted on being released from any obligation of tenure at Brookwood because he desired to be free to take a position in an academic institution (not in the field of labor education), at any time opportunity might offer, even in the midst of a school year. This spring his colleagues on the faculty simply requested the Board of Directors not to reëngage him for the future. The only body from which he might have been expelled was Brooklyn Local 189 of the American Federation of Teachers, but no expulsion measure has been taken or contemplated.

The annual Conference of Teachers in the field of workers' education, to which Mr. Calverton refers, is conducted not by Brookwood directly, but by Brookwood Local 189 of the American Federation of Teachers, which includes Brookwood faculty members and a number of other persons. It is true that in other years teachers of workers' classes with affiliations from extreme right to extreme left have been invited. The situation in workers' education during the past year was a very special one. It seemed important to bring together for conference those people who, because they were out of accord with American Federation of Labor official policies toward workers' education, and yet not Communists, faced a common problem. When the matter was discussed in the meeting of the Brookwood local, Dr. Calhoun readily agreed that no representative of the Workers' Education Bureau of America, for example, should be invited this year, but argued vigorously for inviting a representative of the Workers' (Communist) School. He had no objection, in other words, to the change in policy as to issuing invitations, which Mr. Calverton seems to think was important, but only to the impartial application of the policy. When the local voted against Dr. Calhoun on this proposition, he resigned from the committee in charge of the program and absented himself from the sessions of the conference. Where Mr. Calverton gets the notion that Dr. Calhoun was not "invited" to attend the conference to which he and other members of Local 189 were hosts, is a mystery to me.

Brookwood and the members of the Brookwood staff have not changed their general alignment in the labor movement. Brookwood was founded and has throughout been supported by the so-called progressive elements in the labor movement who were out of accord with many of the fundamental policies of the official labor movement on the one hand, and with certain Communist policies and tactics on the other hand. There has never been any secret about this. During the past year Brookwood has simply refused to be pushed from its course either to the right or to the left.

It is Dr. Calhoun who would have had us change our policy so that we should have become a Communist-dominated left-wing institution. At a meeting of the Brookwood Board of Directors, for example, he stated that he thought Brookwood should be definitely "a left-wing institution" and, in answer to a question, stated that the left-wing position was that no fundamental social change could be accomplished without violent revolution, and that failure to keep this constantly before the workers constituted treason to labor. Whatever any of us may think of this proposition as an historical generalization or a statement of abstract theory, we hold that it is irrelevant in the present situation in America, is out of accord with historical Brookwood policy, and if accepted, would make us, whether or not anyone so intended, a Communist-dominated institution. We did not wish to be placed in such a position any more than we wish to be dominated by the present officialdom of the American Federation of Labor. To contend that under the circumstances the rest of the staff should continue to work with Dr. Calhoun—in other words, that Brookwood could be at the same time a Communist-dominated institution and not a Communist-dominated institution—seems to us simply absurd.

Just here, of course, is the reason why it was this year that Dr. Calhoun's colleagues came to the conclusion that they could not any longer work with him. So long as it was a question of his views on economic, political and social matters, they defended to the utmost his right to freedom in teaching, especially because they were and are convinced of his scrupulous honesty as a teacher and discussion leader in the class room. When it became a question of changing the fundamental character and alignment of the institution, they had to make a clear decision as to whether they did or did not favor such a change, and they declined to be placed in the position of having to work with one who insisted on contending for a policy irreconcilable with the one they were instructed to carry out, and who, moreover, had no faith in their honesty and courage.

The progressive elements in the labor movement are precisely the ones which have always insisted that "freedom of instruction" should prevail in workers' education, so that it might be saved "from the paralyzing hand of dogma," that students should be accepted in workers' classes without discrimination because of their political, social, religious or economic views and affiliations, and that the aim should be primarily to teach them "how to think, not what to think." This has been the policy of Brookwood and it continues to be. Brookwood's recent action signifies not "the downfall of independent labor education in the United States," but a renewed declaration of independence in labor education.

Katonah, N. Y. A. J. MUSTE.

The Gastonia Case

SIR: The American Civil Liberties Union would greatly appreciate an opportunity to clarify for its friends among your readers certain facts bearing on the relation of the Union to the defense of the Gastonia (N. C.) cases which will come to trial July 29.

Fifteen of the defendants are held without bail on the charge of having murdered Chief of Police Aderholt on June 7; the remaining eight are under $750 bail each on the charge of assault with intent to kill. The death of Chief Aderholt occurred when he and his men entered forcibly with arms and without warrant, on property of striking textile workers. The charge of murder is "constructive"—that is, it amounts to a charge of conspiracy to commit murder, which is a first-degree offense. Most of those against whom it is brought were recognized leaders in the textile strike.

A formidable array of special prosecutors, including leaders of the Gastonia County bar and counsel for the mill corporations, has been engaged, with practically unlimited resources at their disposal. It is already perfectly clear that the accused men and women

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will be tried for heresy—political, economic, religious—at the same time that they are in jeopardy for the crimes charged against them. The feeling against them is bitter and state-wide. Every effort will be made to convict as many of them as possible. The state is determined to send some of them to the electric chair.

A number of clear civil liberties issues are involved, such as the right to organize and to strike, the right to hold lawful meetings and enjoy free speech, the right to be unmolested in a private domain, the right of private opinion, and the right to a fair trial in court. Dr. John Randolph Neal of Knoxville, Tenn., who was counsel for John Thomas Scopes in the Tenessee evolution case, is one of the lawyers for the defense (engaged at our suggestion), and will naturally have these issues specially at heart. But the overshadowing fact in this case is that men and women are being held for their lives on strictly criminal charges. In such a situation civil liberties issues, however important, are necessarily subordinate. We therefore recognize the reasonableness of the insistence by the International Labor Defense, which specializes in working class cases and has a particular interest in this group of defendants, that the defense should be conducted under that organization's sole sponsorship.

At the same time the American Civil Liberties Union is keenly and sympathetically interested. Conscious of that interest and anxious to be helpful, many of our friends have been asking us to receive contributions for the support of the case. While we cannot, under the circumstances, ask for such contribution, we have decided to form a fund for the convenience of those who would like to help. Such amounts as we receive will be turned over to Dr. Neal to be disbursed at his discretion strictly for legal defense and expenses. Checks may be made payable to the American Civil Liberties Union and mailed to 100 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

FORREST BAILEY
Director the American Civil Liberties Union
New York City.

How to Relieve the Farmers

SIR: Your editorial of June 26, "Are the Farmers Relieved?", well expresses some half-truths. "Limitation of production" is the key to the problem, but the suggestion is pretty far-fetched that such a thing is possible by any means now within the purview of the administration. In common with the latter, with Congressmen and farm leaders, you have ignored the law of shifting benefits—the fact that any effective measure for relief can lead to but one possible result. Whenever a profit shows up for the actual producer, the price of land to the succeeding occupant is proportionally increased. The title-holder has cashed in or absorbed all the available aid. This law applies with equal force against any benefit, whether it reduces the spread between producer and consumer, as contemplated by the coöperatives, lowers the cost of production, as illustrated this season by the general use of the combine in harvesting wheat, or concerns improved methods of crop rotation and stock raising, as featured by the colleges.

For example: a man specializes in poultry raising, say, on a ten-acre tract, and by unusual industry and ability makes a good living and an apparent profit. Do others who would like to follow in his steps have such a chance? Not for long. Forthwith, every tract of land too barren or rough for other purposes, yet within a flivver radius of town, is boosted by professional promoters to double or quadruple the former value and unloaded on prospective poultrymen as a chicken ranch. The price paid for the privilege of starting operations dooms most ventures to failure. Even the experienced and successful raiser cannot pay interest and taxes on this inflated valuation and repeat his performance. This is to say that, according to our land-tenure custom, the outstanding achievement of any one producer results in overcapitalization of opportunity by all holders and agents. As a natural result, the oncoming generation of farmers must in turn have relief or else face certain failure.

Now there is a sane and logical method for reduction of production on any one staple to a point where the demand will absorb the supply at a profit—even on, at present, still inflated land values. Let the administrators offer worth-while inducements for the small farmers to switch to other crops, especially legumes that will help to maintain fertility of the soil and cheapen the cost of raising livestock. It is the cost and risk of seeding that now stand in the way of the universal practice of crop rotation. The vast revolving fund which the country has so generously advanced should be used primarily for supplying this seed—actually presenting it free where soil and climatic conditions are suited and preparation is adequate. Thus, most of the winter-wheat land can alternate with sweet or red clover, soy beans will grow with corn or as a catch crop, and winter vetch can follow cotton or potatoes.

But should the public be burdened with extra taxes to provide this special privilege to agriculture? Though we follow such a policy with respect to manufacturers, it is unnecessary in this proposal. There is a proper source for the necessary fund. It is the increase in the selling price of the land, which certainly will follow the offer of free seed. The assessors can easily find out what this increase amounts to in added asking price and levy a tax in proportion. The land will go no higher but the industry will thrive.

WALTER S. WRIGHT.
Kansas City, Mo.

The Case of the Small Farm

SIR: Farming is like any other business in that only by careful analysis of costs can the influence of any one factor of management upon the success or failure of the enterprise be determined. After reading "Mass Production on the Farm," by Robert Stewart, in your issue of July 17, in which such an analysis is conspicuously absent, I am convinced that Dean Stewart has set out to prove a point—the desirability of corporation farming—rather than give an unbiased comparison of the profitableness of large as against small farms. There are many factors that determine the degree of success of any farm, but from a renter's standpoint the greatest factor is the amount of rent. Dean Stewart in his discussion of the Campbell Farming Corporation says, "It is reported that the bare land is leased from the Department of the Interior on the basis of one-fourteenth of the gross returns. This is a very favorable rental." Indeed it is, so much so that the small tenant farmer in the Middle West must needs be an extremely slovenly manager not to make high profits when renting on such easy terms. The usual rent of bare ground in the Middle West is one-half the gross returns, which is seven times the proportional rent paid by the Campbell corporation. In fact, this low rent enjoyed by the Campbell Farming Corporation is equivalent to nothing less than a large subsidy from the Department of the Interior. No wonder that "as special investigator of farm lands on the Indian Reservations for the Department of the Interior, Mr. Campbell early became impressed with the possibility offered by these lands. . . . . ."

There is another aspect of this business which should be considered. It is well known that the farmers of the United States are suffering from an overproduction of wheat. Why, then, should the Department of the Interior lease public domains to a corporation on ridiculously easy terms in order that more wheat, of which we already have too much, should be produced? Note too that the fertility is being mined from the soil of these public domains under circumstances which apparently seem comparable to the scandalous circumstances of Teapot Dome. Should not this be a subject for congressional investigation?

Before Dean Stewart can convince us of the desirability of corporation farming, he must first properly discount the terms of the lease under which this corporation, the one example he gives us, operates.

Again, Dean Stewart offers an instance of "chains of small farms under one management" as good evidence of the need of large-scale management. Here the scene shifts from the Far West to Champaign County in Illinois, in which there is some of the best soil of the corn belt. A bank has taken over the management of thirty-two farms totalling 7,500 acres and placed an agricultural expert in charge of them. One of these farms, under the expert's supervision, has paid 6 percent on the capital invested over a period of five years. That is very good work. But it is not unique, and it certainly has nothing to do with large-scale management; for the agricultural expert can give no more service than any farmer can obtain from service agencies such

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as the Champaign Farm Bureau, the Illinois Agricultural Association, and the College of Agriculture at the University of Illinois. That a return of more than 6 percent on the capital investment may be obtained without large-scale management can be easily shown from the accounts for the year 1928 of thirty-six farms of a little over 200 acres each, most of which are in Champaign County, as presented by the Department of Farm Organization and Management of the University of Illinois. Of these thirty-six farms a dozen of the most profitable showed an average net return of 8.36 percent on the capital invested, after paying the farmer a laborer's wage for his year's work. Such profits are certainly not common, but they show that it is intelligent management rather than the size of the operation which determines the degree of success. I have at hand figures from the University of Illinois which illustrate still another case that proves this point. This farm is a very small one, only fifty-four acres, and yet by skilful management in 1927 the net returns amounted to 10.91 percent of the capital invested.

Were it not for our rapidly developing great farmer coöperatives such as the Land O' Lakes Creameries and the National Livestock Producers' Association and others, each of which does annual business to the extent of many millions of dollars, there would be some advantage held by the large farms over the small. But as it is, through our coöperatives, small farms are benefited in ways supposedly available only to great corporations.

We farmers are not suffering from any lack of efficiency which may be supplied by corporation or "chain farming." As has been so aptly pointed out by the editor of The New Republic, our troubles are largely due to legislative discrimination against the farmer. This condition is not new. Legislative discrimination against the farmer has existed almost continuously from the earliest dawn of civilization, as any student of agricultural history knows.

WILLIAM BREWSTER TABER, JR.

Kansas, Ill.

Russian and American Movies

SIR: In his article on Russian film technique in your issue of July 3, Gilbert Seldes commits an error of judgment that is common to those critics and students of the American film industry who seek to explain the esthetic and moral debility of the American films on the grounds that Hollywood needs a revolution in the direction of the Russian producers.

The persistence of the silent film, writes Mr. Seldes, and presumably the improvement of American films along intellectual and artistic lines, "will be due to the incorporation in American movies of something of the spirit and something of the technique of these comparative newcomers in the field." The new spirit and the new technique, he implies, will have to result from a spiritual revolution in Hollywood.

After enumerating some of the major virtues of Russian films, he reports that "enthusiasts for the Russian films have often been unable to separate the cinematic from the economic, and have apparently been willing to start a red revolution in Britain and America in order to produce an Eisenstein or a Pudowkin." At this point Mr. Seldes exhibits a typically American horror of, and contempt for, revolution. Shuddering at the thought of an upheaval which, like the one so graphically and so essentially pictured in "The End of St. Petersburg" and "Ten Days That Shook the World," might change social and economic conditions in the United States just far enough to permit an Eisenstein and a Pudowkin to practise their art, he goes on to assure us that "if the revolution could be localized in the Balkan territories of Hollywood," he should "think it worth while." Now that, precisely, is where Mr. Seldes and like-minded critics of the American screen miss two big points: (1) that a revolution in Hollywood would be meaningless, futile and utterly ineffectual without a corresponding revolution in Middletown; and (2) that Russian cinema art, so far from having been born out of an arid intellectual study of film technique, owes its existence, its passion, its beauty and its form to the event which has supplied it with its exclusive subject-matter. At least, if the subject-matter of the Russian films is not always the Revolution itself, the passion is that of the Revolution, and the "moral fervor," for which Mr. Seldes betrays a deep respect, is the moral fervor of 1917, rooted in a psychology that creates and governs technical conceptions.

The Russian film artists have something vitally important and meaningful to say. Their technical methods of saying it have been determined by a dominant social idea and by its expression in associated images and symbols throughout the film and the individual parts of the film. In his first picture, "Strike!", Eisenstein associated the massacre of a crowd of workmen with the slaughter of a bull. In "Ten Days" he linked the slow bleeding to death of a wounded revolutionist with the squeezing of a lemon over some food by a wealthy magnate at a banquet—a symbolical association with a single undeniable social idea. Nor is it just accidental that an entire school of Russian directors have found the pulling down of huge Tsarist statues by the masses the best means of symbolizing the downcrash of a much-hated regime. Every Russian film is based on solid ideas of association such as these, and every Russian film would be as anemic as ours without them. The association-*montage* and the time-cutting (as in the example of Kerensky walking up the stairs, cited and ably analyzed by Mr. Seldes) exist because the necessity of identifying social conditions with their symbols, social effects with social causes, makes them exist. In every case, it is the spirit, that is, the social and moral idea, that determines what the technique shall be. The technique does not create the spirit. . . .

Universal City, Calif. SEYMOUR STERN.

SIR: Point one in Mr. Stern's letter assumes that Hollywood is giving America as good films as America will accept. This has never been the case and is not the case now. Hollywood has always lagged behind. Hollywood has always said, "America won't stand for this or that" and in every case Hollywood has been wrong. Hollywood, or what corresponded to Hollywood in those days, said that Americans would not stand for a picture longer than one reel; Hollywood set its face against war films until "The Big Parade" forced its hand; Hollywood said the Western was dead until "The Covered Wagon" showed it wasn't; Hollywood said all films have to have plots and counterplots, until the semi-historical film came along. It is true that the successful films which showed that the American people will accept better films than the average Hollywood run were also made by Hollywood producers—but this is only the usual relation of average and exception. Each of the great producing units puts out between fifty and a hundred films annually; of these, one or two are respectable products and are financially as successful as the utterly undistinguished others. My point is that if Hollywood will only give America as good films as America can stand, instead of as trashy films, we shall have the beginnings of a decent industry.

The Russian directors themselves dispute point two, for they give credit to D. W. Griffith, especially his "Birth of a Nation," as a forerunner of their *montage*-technique. That their general esthetic is influenced by their passion for the Revolution, I not only admit, but feel I have emphasized in my article. But I specifically reject the idea that one has to share the economic principles of Communism in order to have either passion or sound esthetic principles. Given a man of genius, Fascism could inspire equally fervent pictures, or, as I suggested, a passion for liberty as some of the American revolutionaries felt it. According to Mr. Stern a great lyric of love could be written only to a woman whom the poets of the entire world found lovely; according to me, it is sufficient that the single poet should find her lovely. We do not know who inspired Shakespeare's sonnets, but recognize their beauty; we may not accept the moral ideas of Plato or the political ideas of Voltaire, but we recognize something profoundly beautiful in "The Republic" and passionately interesting in "Candide." It is the passion itself, not the object of the passion, which counts.

I am chiefly interested in esthetic and technical questions, but I do not dissociate *spirit* from esthetics and technique. I try hard to dissociate *ideas* from esthetics, and I think if this had been done more often in Hollywood, we should have had better films. The ideas of Hollywood are bad enough; but the dominant idea that "a good idea for a picture" necessarily makes a good picture is the worst.

GILBERT SELDES.

Malba, L. I., N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Haitian Speaks for Haïti

L'Occupation Américain d' Haïti, by Dantès Bellegarde. Port-au-Prince: Chéraquit. 45 pages.

Pour une Haïti Heureuse, by Dantès Bellegarde, Port-au-Prince: Chéraquit. Two vols. 747 pages.

WITHIN recent years a number of Americans have attempted to explain to us the native view of the American occupation of Haiti. Complementing their efforts, it is refreshing to find an expression of this view from a Haitian pen. Dantès Bellegarde is a distinguished educator and publicist who was formerly Haitian minister to Paris and delegate to the League of Nations. In the latter capacity he won an international reputation in inducing the 1922 Assembly to act in regard to the Bondelzwarts rebellion in the mandate of Southwest Africa.

M. Bellegarde declares that, before the American intervention of 1915 took place, no insult had been made to the American flag, and that no American citizen had been molested; the government had not defaulted in any financial obligation to the United States. He states that the United States was no more justified in intervening in Haiti to correct internal abuse than it would be to intervene for this purpose in the Balkans, Russia or China. He believes that the American intervention was in violation of international law, and that the real cause for the intervention was to assist certain American financial interests. He declares that in the first four years of the occupation, American soldiers "massacred" 3,500 Haitian peasants, a figure which probably exceeds the number of victims in all of the Haitian revolutions.

Perhaps the greatest value of these volumes is the detailed account given of the American occupation between 1918 and 1921. In the former year M. Bellegarde became Minister of Public Instruction and of Agriculture under President Dartiguenave. During this early period, the Haitian government struggled valiantly to keep the responsibility for the administration of the country within its own hands. Interpreting the Convention of 1915 literally, it maintained that the American officials in Haiti were there to give advice, and not to govern. This conception, however, the United States resented. One of the first clashes took place over M. Bellegarde's proposal for the establishment of a system of agricultural education and for other agrarian and administrative reforms, including the suppression of the *corvée* (forced labor). The United States expressed its opposition to this plan. A military officer assumed the authority himself to abolish the *corvée*. The Haitian cabinet was then told that other features of the proposed bill were in contravention of the 1915 treaty, or involved financial changes to which the United States was opposed. The American Legation in fact declared that it had the right to pass upon all legislative bills of the Haitian government, on the ground that they might be in violation of the 1915 Convention. After blocking the Haitian effort at the regeneration of agriculture, the American authorities introduced a system of agricultural education of their own. M. Bellegarde declares that the whole policy of the United States aimed to prevent any reforms and any progress in Haiti for which the American occupation could not claim sole credit.

According to the 1915 Convention, the American Financial Adviser was declared to be "a functionary attached to the Minister of Finances." In 1918 the American Financial Adviser illustrated his conception of this office by sending a draft budget to the Haitian Council of State, written entirely in English, and asking its adoption virtually without examination or modification. The Council of State declined to adopt this request; whereupon Colonel Russell, in command of the American occupation, and acting under the authority of martial law, prohibited the Haitian government from drawing upon its funds in the local bank. This action led the Haitian government to protest to the American State Department that "the Haitian people are at the mercy of a vexatious and unjust tyranny of American officials who, in violation of the treaty, wish to impose upon the Republic of Haiti budgetary laws and taxes without having been first examined by us. . . ." The Financial Adviser even refused to pay the funeral expenses of the Haitian minister who had died in Washington, on the ground that the budget had not been voted. Upon another occasion this official demanded that the Haitian government grant the exclusive monopoly of importing gold to the National Bank of Haiti, a subsidiary of the National City Bank of New York. When the Haitian government declined to enact the desired legislation, the American authorities decided to hold up the salaries of the Haitian cabinet. We are told that while the American Financial Adviser frequently made long visits to the United States at the expense of the Haitian government, he declined to allow payment of the expenses of the Haitian delegate to the League of Nations in 1921. Upon another occasion he objected to a contract under which three professors from the University of France were to give instruction in the Haitian *lycées*, on the ground that, instead of teaching fifteen hours a week as the contract provided, they should teach twenty-five! He finally declined to approve any appropriation for these professors, alleging lack of funds. But subsequently he authorized the employment of two "expert" rat-catchers at $25c a month, to protect Port-au-Prince against the possible outbreak of plague. In the midst of these difficulties the Council of State considered the advisability of appealing to the League of Nations, of which Haiti was a member invoking the protection of Article 10 against the United States. But the League was still in its swaddling clothes the United States was a hostile outsider; the proposal was therefore, considered "premature." The incident is, however, an interesting precedent which may possibly be followed to a more rigorous conclusion in the future.

With the election of President Borno in 1922, a second period in the American occupation of Haiti seemed to have been inaugurated. The Haitian government now surrendered to the American authorities; and virtually the entire administration of the country passed into American hands. Opposition to American rule no longer comes from the Haitian government; it now emanates from the Haitian *élite* outside of the government, who include some of the most outstanding men in the country.

M. Bellegarde declares that the American Financial Adviser "is the dictator and master of the destinies of the Haitian nation." Every Haitian official has been reduced to the role of an assistant to an American. (The minor role now played by Haitian officials in the government is also shown by an article by Dr. Millspaugh, former Financial Adviser, in the last number of Foreign Affairs.) M. Bellegarde states that "the aim of this policy is to *domesticate* the nation and to kill in it the spirit of initiative and also the sentiment of dignity. . . ." In his opinion the "white dictatorship, served by native instrumentalities, is more severe than the old native satrapies." Haitians could drive out of power a native dictator, but they are not strong enough to drive out the Americans.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Despite fourteen years of the American occupation, M. Bellegarde states that Haiti has failed to enjoy peace, liberty or prosperity. A "peace" imposed by outside military force cannot, in his opinion, be enduring or real. Haitians have no control over the expenditure of money. Although the United States recognizes native legislatures in Porto Rico and in the Philippines, it has consented to the destruction of the Haitian legislature. The United States has permitted the freedom of the Haitian press to be destroyed; it has overthrown the independence of the judiciary. He contends that material prosperity, the boasted aim of the American occupation, has not been realized. He says that exports since 1915 have been lower than exports prior to that date. On the other hand, the United States installed a tariff policy that increased the cost of living. Finally he charges the American occupation with race prejudice. Not even the president of Haiti has ever been admitted to the American Club. The rule of the United States is premised, in his opinion, upon a belief in the "complete inferiority" of the Haitian people. They should not be given an opportunity to make mistakes; they should not be given credit for self-regeneration. All the power and all the glory should go to the United States. As far as M. Bellegarde is concerned, racial dignity, individual liberty and national independence are more precious than all the material acquisitions of industry. He closes by expressing the hope that President Hoover will save the Haitian people from the "peril of death."

American officials and others will probably criticize these volumes on the ground that they are extreme and unfair. It should be remembered that M. Bellegarde is no longer a member of the Haitian government. Nevertheless, it is hoped that his books will be widely read in this country, to serve as an antidote to the official reports of the American High Commissioner. Incidentally, these volumes are written in a manner that reflects credit upon the literary ability of the Haitian *élite*.

RAYMOND LESLIE BUELL.

The Wave

The Wave, by Evelyn Scott: Jonathan Cape and Harrison Smith. $2.50.

MRS. SCOTT has always been among the innovators. It is not surprising, therefore, to find her making a new thing of the old, well-established institutions in fiction, the historical novel and the novel of war. The historical novel has regularly sought the appeal of hero worship. It has been an application of Carlyle's view that history is the record of what great men have accomplished in the world. Mrs. Scott's novel is based upon a modern view of history as a mass movement, a succession of waves passing over the face of the human waters, in which the component particles move up and down without changing their position. One such wave, that which we call the American Civil War, Mrs. Scott follows in a multitude of cases of such particles, ranging from Lincoln and Grant, Davis and Lee, to the soldiers in the field, the ladies of Richmond driving to the hills to watch the Seven Days' Battles, the humbler women of the Shenandoah or Gettysburg fluttering like leaves in the path of the storm, the working men of New York rioting against the draft, and the Negroes stampeding with Sherman's army to Savannah. In this series of case histories, there are more than a hundred entries, involving perhaps five hundred witnesses, great or obscure, of the whole course of the war, from Dickie Ross rowing out in Charleston Harbor to see the dawn rise which heralded the fall of Fort Sumter, to "Miss Imogene" and her children, in church on the last fatal Sunday of Richmond's glory, seeing Mr. Davis receiving the note which caused him to leave hurriedly in the midst of the service—to Lee reviewing his famished troops and making his surrender to his conscience as a soldier before he gave his sword to Grant—to Lincoln joking in the box at Ford's Theater, with John Wilkes Booth hovering outside—to Mrs. Deering and her niece watching the last grand parade of the armies of the West under Sherman, on Pennsylvania Avenue. The wave rises higher as it is about to break.

What Mrs. Scott has done with the novel of war is clear from the foregoing account, and it is equally revolutionary. The conventional war novel of the nineteenth century, as practised by James Grant, Charles Lever and Captain Marryat, was a romance of adventure, brutal or humorous, illuminated by the glory of patriotism. The type was continued by Kipling, and revived in the World War by Captain Ian Hay Beith and others, with whom it fell into the contempt bestowed upon propaganda and its agents. Thackeray introduced the realistic treatment of war in "Vanity Fair," in his version of Waterloo behind the lines; Tolstoy, in "War and Peace," extended it to include the whole mass of the fighting nation; and the World War has produced a series of authentic reminiscences from every fighting front, in which the old glamor of battle has been extinguished forever. Mrs. Scott's method allows her to combine the methods of all modern treatments of war—she sees it in the physical sufferings of fighting men, in the doubtful mental operations of their leaders, in the hope and fear, the love and the grief of the helpless multitude of men and women behind the lines. Underneath this mass of humanity the wave of war surges, lifting it to the crest or dropping it into the trough, but leaving it where it was, static in oscillation.

"The Wave" is a mass novel made up of distinct particles like drops. There is no underlying pattern, no persistence of character. The unity of the book is due to a cohesion which cannot be defined in terms of structure. It is due to an extraordinary feeling for the Civil War as an episode characteristic of these states in its geographical range and physical conformation—above all, in its psychology. Mrs. Scott knows the old South, its landscape and people. She has an acute perception of nature, and the part it played in that struggle, through its mountains and forests and swamps, its heat and dust and rain. She has an intimate sense of human consciousness in its account of the world without and that within, its discrimination of subtle shades of physical suffering and mental confusion. The prevailing note of the experience she details is masochistic. Again, Mrs. Scott has a feeling for the values of the inanimate things which lie about us as properties in the parts we play, without which we should lack reality to ourselves. Doubtless this dependence upon material things was especially strong in the patriarchal manorial civilization of the South. These are qualities of Mrs. Scott to which we are accustomed from her earlier work. In "The Wave" she displays them more abundantly and yet employs them with more restraint. Undoubtedly all this calls for an answering effort on the part of the reader, accustomed to the support of sustained narrative and the accruing interest of persisting characters. He will need patience to integrate a world presented in fragments, and to correlate a mass of constantly shifting shapes and colors. But he will have his reward.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Knights of Labor

The Labor Movement in the United States, 1860-1895, by Norman J. Ware. New York: D. Appleton and Company. 409 pages. $3.

THE RISE and fall of the Knights of Labor was at once the most dramatic and the most crucial epoch in the history of the American labor movement. For with the defeat of the Knights by the American Federation of Labor, American labor was shunted down the track of "business" rather than "uplift" unionism, and the whole course of the movement altered. But the inner history of this striving period of mass movements, of strikes and riots, of plots and counterplots has remained shadowy and mysterious. One has inevitably risen from reading the proceedings and contemporary accounts of the Knights, the personal reminiscences of such leaders as Powderly, Buchanan, MacNeil and Gompers, and the historical sketches by Perlman and Kirk, with the feeling that there were still other mysterious crossings of purpose and conflicts of interest than those disclosed. The usual explanation that the struggle between the Knights and the international craft unions was one waged between the unskilled with their mixed assemblies and the skilled with their cohesive craft bodies has always seemed a bit too simple, while the accounts which have been given of the tangled web of negotiations between the leaders of the two groups have been, in their larger aspects, virtually incomprehensible.

Mr. Ware's perspicacious study throws a great shaft of light upon these tumultous and confused years. He shows that the craft element in the Knights, represented by the trade assemblies, was always more important than Perlman and Commons, for example, have implied. In 1882, two-thirds of the local assemblies were organized on the trade basis, and even in 1886, over half of the local unions which were attached to the district bodies were trade rather than mixed assemblies. It was only in the locals, which were then attached directly to the National Assembly, that the mixed groups predominated. The change in the composition of the Order came, indeed, not so much from the inrush of the unskilled as from growth in the agricultural West and South. It was the alliance between the general uplift program of the West and the "rule or ruin" methods of the leaders of the New York District Assembly which finally committed the Order to a concerted policy of open opposition to the organization of the crafts under separate and independent international unions. But the members of the Knights were, on the other hand, quite willing, save during the years 1880-1881, to create national trade assemblies within the Knights of Labor which would permit craftsmen to combine with their fellows in a more or less autonomous fashion. The window-glass workers, for example, had a successful national organization within the Knights, and national trade assemblies were also formed for the plate-glass workers, the stone workers, the miners and the brewers. The Knights tried, moreover, to induce other national trade unions, such as the printers and the iron and steel workers, to affiliate with them as trade assemblies, and it was probably only the opposition of the cigar makers, led by Gompers and Strasser, and of the carpenters, under the leadership of P. J. McGuire, together with the mistakes of the Home Club in New York and of Powderly, which prevented a number of these unions from affiliating.

The decline of the Knights was indeed caused not so much by the opposition of the skilled as by the failure of the various strikes of 1886, when the feeble financial resources of the Knights were pitted against the ruthless capitalistic organizations which had grown up after the Civil War, and by the shivers of terror which the Haymarket Massacre sent down the vertebræ of the American citizenry. Since failure is even more cumulative than success, members drifted out of the Order almost as rapidly as they had entered it, and by 1894 the triumph of Gompers was complete. Interestingly enough, the passage of the two industrial unions of brewery workers and of miners out of the Knights into the American Federation of Labor formed the nucleus in the latter organization which favored, during the period prior to 1917, industrial unionism, socialism and political action.

One of the most valuable features of Mr. Ware's study is the added comprehension which it gives of the characters of both Gompers and Powderly. Gompers is shown to have been a "borer from within" the Knights, holding membership in the Order as late as 1884, and with the probable connivance of Frank K. Foster using a local assembly of cigar-makers as a means of securing in large quantities the white labels of the Knights. These were then apparently applied to cigars manufactured by members of Gompers' own independent international union. In the light of such practices, his virtuous indignation in later years against borers within the American Federation of Labor seems somewhat ironical.

Powderly emerges from the narrative as a figure of lath and plaster and as unreal a poseur in the field of labor as was Louis Napoleon in European politics. Vain and jealous, loving power, never knowing his own mind, and blown hither and thither by the force of events, he was no match for the compact and almost venomous energy of Gompers.

This book is a most worthy continuation of Dr. Ware's excellent earlier volume on the period from 1840 to 1860, and it arouses the keenest anticipation of the final volume, in which the thrilling story of the last thirty-five years will be told.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Peace on Earth

Disarmament, by Professor Salvador de Madariaga. New York: Coward-McCann. 379 pages. $5.

WHEN the Sub-Committee "A" on Disarmament at Geneva used, in a little more than six months, a little less than four million sheets of paper, there was some reason to hope that, after such vast expenditure, the world was nearer the reign of everlasting peace. At Geneva, however, it is a bitter and only too well-recognized fact that, as far as the problem of disarmament is concerned, the infinite labor and patience exercised for ten years by the experts of almost every country in the world have been out of all proportion to the feeble fruits they have produced. It is a depressing fact, and one that would have been more depressing still a month or two ago. But, now, in England, at any rate, there is a strong feeling of hope abroad. For with the advent to power of a Labor government, and with the arrival of a new ambassador in the person of General Dawes, a serious effort is being made to come to an agreement with the United States on the vexed question of naval disarmament. How long this effort will last, and how long the hopes of people on each side of the Atlantic will stay as high as they are at present, it is impossible to foretell. Much breath and still more paper may have to be wasted before anything ap-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aching a satisfactory conclusion is reached; but for the moment, at any rate, something definite is being done without much waste of either.

For five years, as Chief of the Disarmament Section of the League of Nations Secretariat, Professor Madariaga had an unexampled opportunity for studying the methods of the breath- and paper-wasters, and he has now recorded his observations in a book which should be read by every reader of The New Republic. It is not a technical treatise, and it is not a dull history, but an intensely interesting and successful attempt to show how disarmament has failed in the past, why it has failed, and the lines along which it must be approached if it is to succeed in the future. Personally I should like everybody who has read, say, "All Quiet on the Western Front," to read this book as well; and if it is too much to expect that everybody will, then I hope that every diplomat, and, indeed, anyone in any way connected with foreign affairs, will do so without fail.

Professor Madariaga's book falls naturally into three sections: critical, historical, and prospective. In the first part he examines disarmament from the theoretical point of view. Which are to be abolished, wars or armaments? Or, if neither, are we to be content with a mere reduction of the latter? Secondly, he shows how the members of the League of Nations have attempted to grapple with these irreconcilable views, and their utter failure to arrive at any satisfactory settlement. And lastly, he shows why they have failed, and how, in his opinion, they may one day succeed, if only they will lay aside desire for personal gain, national prestige, and all the many other miserable objectives which diplomats are paid to pursue, and upon which vast sums of money, and sometimes lives, are spent in an attempt to preserve them. Obviously it is not as simple as it sounds, and Professor Madariaga is too intelligent not to know that the lamb will not lie down with the lion without either adequate guarantees or some long-established feeling of trust and sincerity. Indeed, as long as rivalry and not coöperation exists between states, even during a period of apparent peace and prosperity, so long will war be a menace to mankind. War, it is true, has been outlawed; that is to say, the nations of the world have agreed that, as an instrument of national policy, war is illegal. This solemn pact is a step in the right direction, though by itself it is no guarantee whatsoever that wars will not arise in the future. Something more is needed—a world community, willing to take its disputes to Geneva for arbitration by a permanent court of international justice; and what is more important, willing to abide by its ruling. Like the bedding of the lion and the lamb, this spirit of coöperation cannot be exchanged in a night for the evil spirit of discord and rivalry that has infleunced man's dealings with his neighbor ever since the days of Cain and Abel.

And naturally, as long as the United States remains outside the League, the task must be a slow one. Something, it is true, may be achieved by agreements outside the jurisdiction of the League, such as those which are at this moment being set on foot between Washington and London, but it is inevitable that smaller nations should regard such negotiations with suspicion, and in the nature of old-fashioned diplomatic treaties, which history has shown do not always have universal peace as their aim and end. And in this connection it is significant that both General Dawes and Mr. MacDonald were obliged, at the conclusion of their first meeting, to announce to the world at large that any results their conversations might have were not to be regarded as secret engagements from which the interests of the rest of the world had been deliberately excluded.

By way of conclusion, some of Professor Madariaga's remarks are worth quoting:

> We do not advocate holiness (. . . the person who goes about feeling like Bismarck and speaking like Jesus Christ . . .); we advocate sense.
>
> We do not want to destroy war. We want to create peace.
>
> The price of peace is eternal vigilance, but also eternal activity.

And finally:

> If men do not deliberately walk towards peace, they will drift into war.

JOHN HAYWARD.

Chicago

Chicago, by Charles E. Merriam. New York: The Macmillan Company. 305 pages. $3.50.

WHATEVER may be said against Chicago, there is this to be said for it: there is no other city in the United States whose name would have so great an appeal as the title of a book. Emblazoned upon a paper jacket above the eclectic sky-line which decorates it, it is certain to attract attention, for Chicago is impressed upon the public consciousness of the nation. Chicago is news.

Why it is news is really the subject-matter of Mr. Charles E. Merriam's analytical study of urban politics, for Chicago is the laboratory in which he has worked out his conclusions. Some of the material he uses is common to all the cities in the country, and more of it concerns the few larger only, but much of it is native stuff. The conditions underlying gang murders, graft scandals, delayed traction settlements, elections of William Hale Thompson, high waves of community resentment and corresponding shallows of indifference, are set forth so that the man who runs may read—and would better, for I am convinced that an intelligent candidate for office could find nothing more to his advantage than study of Mr. Merriam's book. Every type of urban constituent is analyzed there, and every thread of the extraordinary, complicated interweaving of nationalities, religions, interests and groups which constitute Chicago is identified.

Mr. Merriam, a professor of Political Science in the University of Chicago, has been for some twenty years a participant in public affairs. Bringing to those affairs a mind trained to understand and guide them, he is exceptionally well fitted to write of Chicago. As a member of the City Council he had unique opportunities to observe at first hand the intricacies of municipal government. His book is a clinic of graft, and in it he challenges the truth of the old adage that it is more blessed to give than to receive. With convincing clearness he demonstrates that the man who pays and the man who takes are equally guilty. He spreads the responsibility for the "Big Fix" all the way from the racketeer to the church-going contributor to dubious campaign funds.

Of especial interest to his fellow townsmen is the brilliant chapter on "Chicago Leaders." Politicians, idealists, business men, labor leaders, they pass vividly before us, all treated with tolerant fairness—notwithstanding that reformers, among whom Mr. Merriam may be listed, are not always fair.

He makes no effort to convince: his art lies in that. He states situations with extraordinary clearness, cites episodes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to prove them, and offers no weakly idealistic solutions. His is to reason why, only. His work, fascinating though the result may be, is as exact as a scientist's, and he is an absolute master of his field. In the language of the politician, "the Professor knows his stuff."

The author says himself that opinions differ as to whether the modern city is the hope of democracy, or its despair. Chicago is, perversely, both. In the chapter on the City Plan, Mr. Merriam shows himself to be as naïvely proud as any native son could be of the astonishing material progress of Chicago. The exciting ramparts of her wide-flung sky-line thrill him as deeply as they may any unreasoning city-booster. Other towns have developed wide boulevards and beautiful parks. Their architects have built buildings as fine as, or finer than, those in Chicago. Their railroads have been forced to electrify; their city councils, too, have sponsored zoning ordinances. No one knows this better than Mr. Merriam; nevertheless there is, to him, something unique in the prowess of his home town, and it is an endearing feature of his book to find that he shares this amiable weakness which has, for years before California knew it had a climate, distinguished the true Chicagoan.

The title localizes his book somewhat, but a large part of his material is of national interest. One's understanding of the United States is appreciably deepened by reading Mr. Merriam's book.

JANET A. FAIRBANK.

Ardors of an Archeologist

Old Civilizations of the New World, by A. Hyatt Verrill. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company. 393 pages. $5.

MR. VERRILL has managed to use a considerable accumulation of material on early American cultures, some of it based on his own explorations, in such a way as to make his book read like a railway folder. It is to be hoped that his volume will not fall into the hands of persons entirely ignorant of European and Asiatic archeology. Without some standards to go by, a reader might be tempted to accept reiterated exaggerations and naïve ardors as scientific judgments, although even an unprepared reader might sooner or later wonder if every obscure culture center could be equally the most "mysterious" and the most "fascinating" of all. To those who hope some day to see a just appreciation of Maya art among moderns, it is depressing to come on sentences like this: ". . . no other American race, nor for that matter any race, ever approached them in the complexity, the extent and the beauty of their stone sculptures."

For a scientist, Mr. Verrill is too easily surprised. He says it was much to his "amazement" that he found the Guaymís using the *atlatl* "of the Aztecs." Since the spear thrower is common to peoples as scattered in time and place as the Eskimo, the Australians, and the ancient Magdalenians, there is nothing surprising about finding it in Panama. When he remarks, to enhance his atmosphere of wonder, that the surgeons who operated on the skulls of the early Peruvians worked with a "probable lack of all anesthetics," he is ignoring the researches of paleopathologists (Roy L. Moodie, for example) who have established the facts.

Altogether, Mr. Verrill's book lacks a sense of proportion, a fault from which excellent illustrations, a long bibliography, and the special knowledge of the author do not rescue it.

LYMAN BRYSON.

Weeds over Bronze

The Fate of the Jury, by Edgar Lee Masters. New York: D. Appleton and Company. 173 pages. $2.50.

IT IS not surprising that Edgar Lee Masters has returned to his "Domesday Book" and attempted something in the nature of an epilogue. Most likely Masters looks back at the "Domesday Book" as his masterpiece his major effort to construct the great American tragedy. Even though the book is almost forgotten a few years after publication, it has enough vitality to be revived and rediscovered again and again. It is a classic of its kind, sprawling through miles of blank verse that is sometimes crippled prose, sometimes excellent poetry, but the impact of the entire work has the force of significant literature.

But the life and death of Elenor Murray, a symbol of America, lacked a catharsis. Somehow the essential tragedy, resulting in the defeat of human ideals, refused to purge itself, and the necessity for an epilogue became evident. So we have "The Fate of the Jury," the lives of the men who attempted to find a meaning hidden within the details of the career of a young girl. There is the story of George Borrow, the lawyer who has an honest love of human justice but whose love gradually becomes his weakness; his standards of ethical conduct grow dim and at last are washed away in floods of pink-tea liberalism. There is Marion, the magazine editor, who might have been a poet, dying in poverty, his magazine crushed by private interests. There is Samuel Ritter, the banker, ruined by a wife turned Lesbian. Frustration makes an end of the entire company, finally striking down the coroner, Merival, whose wife goes insane. All this is written in blank verse that has a higher percentage of poetry than the "Domesday Book," yet it falls short of the major work. This is only natural, for Masters has undoubtedly attempted to wind up his story in a minor key. Here is the coda, bitter and diminutive, the grave of Elenor Murray sinking into the earth; weeds and grass rising above a bronze tablet.

HORACE GREGORY.

Contributors

ROBERT W. BAGNALL is the director of Branches of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. He is a lecturer, nd contributes to many magazines.

THOMAS W. HOLLAND has been, for the past year, an adviser in the Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin. In the fall, he will enter the faculty of Rutgers College.

SOMERSET LOGAN has for many years been an actor, a writer, and a director on the West Coast.

LEWIS MUMFORD, critic of American life and letters, is the author of "The Story of Utopias", and "Sticks and Stones." His latest book is "Herman Melville."

RAYMOND LESLIE BUELL is Research Director of the Foreign Policy Association, and author of a number of books of which "Present Day Europe" is the most recent.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS is professor of Political Economy at the University of Chicago.

JOHN HAYWARD is an Englishman who edited the Nonesuch Press edition of Donne and Rochester.

JANET A. FAIRBANK has been prominent in civic enterprises in Chicago. She has written dramatic criticism for The Chicago Herald and The Chicago Evening Post.

LYMAN BRYSON is Director of the California Association for Adult Education, and will take charge of the state program in September.

HORACE GREGORY is a poet whose work has appeared in "Transition", "The American Caravan," and other publications.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED